arXiv:1206.2968v2 [math.OC] 26 Mar 2013

# Global Equilibria of Multi-leader Multi-follower Games

Ankur A. Kulkarni Uday V. Shanbhag*

**Abstract**

Multi-leader multi-follower games are a class of hierarchical games in which a collection of leaders compete in a Nash game constrained by the equilibrium conditions of another Nash game amongst the followers. The resulting equilibrium problems are complicated by nonconvex agent problems and therefore providing tractable conditions for existence of global or even local equilibria has proved challenging. Consequently, much of the extant research on this topic is either model specific or relies on weaker notions of equilibria. In the first part of the paper, we provide what is perhaps the first general existence to such games. Our central idea is to relate the global minima of certain optimization problems to equilibria of these games. We show that if the objectives of the leaders admit a *quasi-potential* function, one can construct an optimization problem (a mathematical program with equilibrium constraints (MPEC)) whose global minimum is an equilibrium of the game. In effect existence of equilibria can be guaranteed by the solvability of an optimization problem, which holds under mild conditions.

We then consider a *modified* formulation in which every leader is cognizant of the equilibrium constraints of all leaders, leading to a *shared constraint game*. This modification allows for more general objectives functions and it is shown that when the leader objectives admit a potential function, the global minima of an optimization problem where the potential function is minimized over the shared constraint, are equilibria of the modified multi-leader multi-follower game. Importantly, equilibria of this modified game *contain* the equilibria, if any, of the original game.

In both instances, local minima and B-stationary points of the associated optimization problem are shown to be local Nash equilibria and Nash B-stationary points of the corresponding multi-leader multi-follower game. We note through several examples that such potential multi-leader multi-follower games capture a breadth of application problems of interest. We demonstrate these findings on a multi-leader multi-follower Cournot game.

## 1 Introduction

Contemporary market models in imperfectly competitive regimes are complicated by the need to capture the rationality of a participant to the fullest extent possible. For instance, power markets are often characterized by a sequence of clearings, such as in the day-ahead and real-time markets. Consequently, models of these strategic interactions require a firm to be modeled as not just strategic with respect to its rivals but also as cognizant of the real-time market clearing to follow [44, 43, 38]. Similarly, generation firms participating in a transmission-constrained power market are often modeled as being leaders with respect to the transmission provider that sets transmission prices [6, 20]. Common to both models is a *hierarchical structure* in which a set of participants, designated *leaders*, participate in a Nash game

---

[*] The first author is with the Systems and Control Engineering group at the Indian Insitute of Technology Bombay, Mumbai 400076, India, while the second author is with the Department of Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering at the Pennsylvania State University at University Park. They are reachable at (`kulkarni.ankur@iitb.ac.in,udaybag@psu.edu`). The work of the second author has been partially funded by the NSF CMMI 124688 (CAREER). Finally, the authors would like to thank Profs. T. Başar and J.-S. Pang for their suggestions and comments.

subject to the equilibrium amongst another set of participants called *followers*. The resulting game is referred to as a *multi-leader multi-follower game.* The equilibrium amongst the followers is compactly captured by an *equilibrium constraint* in the optimization problem of a leader, whereby each leader faces a **m**athematical **p**rogram with **e**quilibrium **c**onstraints, or an MPEC [27]. The equilibrium amongst leaders is captured by a problem popularly referred to as an **e**quilibrium **p**rogram with **e**quilibrium **c**onstraints (EPEC) and its associated equilibria, if any, are of interest.

In the context of general EPECs, the present state of knowledge may be summarized as follows. There are several *instances* of EPECs for which equilibria have been shown to exist, but there are also fairly simple EPECs which admit no equilibria [33]. Definitive statements on the existence of equilibria have been obtained mainly for multi-leader multi-follower games with specific structure [39, 40, 43] and for models arising from specific applications, e.g. those in the power industry [7, 29]. In the majority of these settings, the uniqueness of the follower-level equilibrium is leveraged to construct an *implicit problem* which, due to the structure of the problem, allows for the application of standard fixed-point theorems. On another track, existence has been claimed for weaker notions of equilibria, e.g., solutions of the aggregated stationarity conditions of the problems of the leaders [21, 38, 31]. A similar approach for deriving existence statements for games with *regularized* equilibrium constraints was examined by Pang and Scutari [32]. The complementarity conditions have also been the basis of constructing computational approaches [26, 42, 38]. These results and models are surveyed in greater detail in Section 2.1.

At the heart of this absence of general global existence results lies the fact that a mathematical *principle*, on which the existence of an equilibrium of an EPEC may rest, is not known. In conventional convex Nash games, such principles are well known – the fixed point theorems of Brouwer and Kakutani (see [12, 4]). Indeed when the feasible region of the EPEC is convex and compact, the multi-leader multi-follower game can be thought of as a conventional Nash game or a generalized Nash game and the existence of a global equilibrium follows from classical results. But the equilibrium constraint in an EPEC is notorious for being *nonconvex* and for *lacking the continuity properties required* to apply fixed point theory. Consequently, most standard approaches fail to apply to EPECs and there currently exists no general mathematical paradigm that could be built upon to make a theory for general EPECs.

Our interest is in problems where the implicit form and the associated structure *cannot* be directly leveraged to develop a tractable (implicit) problem in leader decisions. Furthermore, our focus is on developing sufficiency conditions for the existence of global equilibria, rather than on guaranteeing that the concatenated stationarity conditions admit solutions, although our approach also provides results of the latter flavor. This paper rests on the following central idea: we relate the minimizer of an optimization problem to the equilibrium of the game, thereby obviating the need to apply fixed point theory. Our main contributions can be summarized as follows:

**(1) Quasi-potential games:** First, we introduce a new class of multi-leader multi-follower games, called *quasi-potential games*, in which the leaders' objectives take on a particular structure, part of which admits a potential function. In the context of such games, we show that the global equilibria of such games are given by the global minimizers of suitably defined optimization problem. Notably, such relationships also extend to local Nash equilibria and B-stationary equilibria. Importantly, in all of these instances, existence of equilibria follows directly from making compactness or coercivity assumptions on the associated MPEC, all of which are verifiable in nature.

**(2) Shared constraint modifications:** Second, we present a *modified* formulation of multi-leader multi-follower competition that admits a *shared constraint* structure. In a game with shared constraints, there exists a *common constraint* that constrains each player's optimization problem [35, 9, 24]. In fact, the equilibria of this game contain the equilibria of the *unmodified* game, if indeed the original game admits equilibria. We show that if the leader objectives admit a potential function, then any minimizer of the potential function over a shared constraint is an equilibrium of the modified game. Additionally, we show that local minimizers and B-stationary points of this MPEC are local Nash equilibria and Nash B-stationary points of the modified game.

All of our existence statements rely on the solvability of an optimization problem and as such can be claimed despite the analytical challenges imposed by nonconvexity and without invoking continuity properties. Furthermore, in each case local minimizers of the optimization problem are local equilibria of this multi-leader multi-follower game. The shared constraint model can be viewed as an alternative, and a better posed, model or can be seen as a vehicle for developing existence statements for the unmodified game.

The remainder of the paper is organized into five sections. In Section 2, we survey multi-leader multi-follower games studied in practice, provide some background and comment on what makes conventional formulations of multi-leader multi-follower games intractable. We provide existence statements for quasi-potential games in Section 3. In Section 4 we present modifications that lead to a shared constraint game and present existence results for them. We apply our techniques towards the analysis of a hierarchical Cournot game in Section 5 and the paper concludes in Section 6 with a brief summary.

## 2 Multi-leader multi-follower games: examples and background

Multi-leader multi-follower games assume relevance when modeling hierarchical competitive interactions. In Section 2.1, we initiate our discussion through several examples considered in literature with the intent of noting that in a majority of these instances, the associated objective functions of the leaders admit a potential function, thereby also noting the utility of this class in practice. A general formulation for such games and the associated equilibrium problem is provided in Section 2.2. In Section 2.3, we conclude this section with a brief commentary on the challenge in applying standard approaches.

### 2.1 Examples of multi-leader multi-follower games

The multi-leader multi-follower game is inspired by a strategic game in economic theory referred to as a Stackelberg game [41]. In such a game, the leader is aware of the follower's reaction and employs that knowledge in making a first move. The follower observes this move and responds as per its optimization problem. An extension to this regime was provided by Sherali et al. [40] where a set of followers compete in a Cournot game while a leader makes a decision constrained by the equilibrium of this game. While multi-leader generalizations were touched upon by Okuguchi [30], Sherali [39] presented amongst the first models for multi-leader multi-follower games in a Cournot regime. A majority of multi-leader multi-follower game-theoretic models appear to fall into three broad categories. We provide a short description of the games arising in each category:

**Hierarchical Cournot games:** In a hierarchical Cournot game, leaders compete in a Cournot game and are constrained by the reactions of a set of followers that also compete in a Cournot game. We discuss a setting comprising of $N$ leaders and $M$ followers, akin to that proposed by Sherali [39]. Suppose the $i^{\text{th}}$ leader's decision is denoted by $x_i$ and the follower strategies conjectured by leader $i$ are collectively denoted by $\{y_i^f\}_{f=1}^M$ where $f$ denotes the follower index. Given the leaders' decisions, follower $f$ participates in a Cournot game in which it solves the following parametrized problem:

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{lll} \mathrm{F}(\bar{y}^{-f}, x) & \underset{y^f}{\text{minimize}} & \frac{1}{2}c_f(y^f)^2 - y^f p\,(\bar{y}+\bar{x})) \\ & \text{subject to} & y_f \geq 0, \end{array}}$$

where $p(.)$ denotes the price function associated with the follower Cournot game, $\frac{1}{2}c_f(y^f)^2$ denotes firm $f$'s quadratic cost of production, $\bar{x} \triangleq \sum_i x_i$, $\bar{y} \triangleq \sum_f y^f$, and $\bar{y}^{-f} \triangleq \sum_{j \neq f} y^j$. Leader $i$ solves the following parametrized problem:

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{lll} \mathrm{L}_i(x^{-i}, y^{-i}) & \underset{x_i, y_i}{\text{minimize}} & \frac{1}{2}d_i x_i^2 - x_i p\left(\bar{x} + \bar{y}_i\right)) \\ & \text{subject to} & y_i^f = \mathrm{SOL}(\mathrm{F}(\bar{y}_i^{-f}, x_i, x^{-i})), \quad \forall\, f, \\ & & x_i \geq 0, \end{array}}$$

where $y_i^f \in \mathbb{R}$ is leader $i$'s conjecture of follower $f$'s equilibrium strategy, $y_i \triangleq \{y_i^f\}_{f=1}^M$, $\frac{1}{2}d_i x_i^2$ denotes the quadratic cost of production of leader $i$, $x^{-i} \triangleq \{x_j\}_{j \neq i}$ and $y^{-i} \triangleq \{y_j^f\}_{j \neq i, f=1}^M$. The equilibrium of the resulting multi-leader multi-follower is given by $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ where $(x_i, y_i)$ is a solution of $\mathrm{L}_i(x^{-i}, y^{-i})$ for $i = 1, \ldots, N$. In this regime, under identical leader costs, Sherali [39] proved the existence and uniqueness of the associated equilibrium. More recently, DeMiguel and Xu [7] extended this result to stochastic regimes wherein the price function is uncertain and the leaders solve expected-value problems.

**Spot-forward markets:** Motivated by the need to investigate the role of forward transactions in power markets, there has been much interest in strategic models where firms compete in the forward market subject to equilibrium in the real-time market. Allaz and Vila [1] examined a forward market comprising of two identical Cournot firms and demonstrated that global equilibria exist in such markets. Furthermore, it was shown that the presence of such a market leads to improved market efficiency. Motivated by the possibly beneficial impacts of forward markets on consumer welfare (cf. [16, 22]), such models have gained increasing importance in the examination of strategic behavior in power markets which are generally characterized by a sequence of clearings in the forward, day-ahead and real-time markets. The result of Allaz and Vila hinges on the assumption that the follower problems are quadratic programs and follower reactions satisfy inequality constraints strictly; consequently, the follower reactions reduce to linear equality constraints. Su [43] extended these existence statements to a multi-player regime where firms need not have identical costs. In such an $N$-player setting, given the forward decisions of the players $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^N$, firm $i$ solves the following parametrized problem in spot-market:

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{lll} \mathrm{S}(z^{-i}, x) & \underset{z_i}{\text{minimize}} & c_i z_i - p\left(\bar{z}\right)\left(z_i - x_i\right) \\ & \text{subject to} & z_i \geq 0, \end{array}}$$

$y_{i,j}$ is the where $c_i z_i$ is the linear cost of producing $z_i$ units in the spot-market, $\bar{z} = \sum_j z_j$ and $p(.)$ is the price function in the spot-market. In the forward market, firm $i$'s objective is given by its overall profit, which is given by $-p^f x_i - p(\bar{y}_i)(y_{i,i} - x_i) + c_i y_{i,i}$, where $p^f$ denotes the price in the forward market $y_{i,j}$ is the anticipated equilibrium production by leader $j$ and $\bar{y}_i = \sum_j y_{i,j}$. By imposing the no-arbitrage constraint that requires that $p^f = p(\bar{y}_i)$, the forward market objective reduces to $c_i y_{i,i} - p(\bar{y}_i) y_{i,i}$. Firm $i$'s problem in the forward market is given by the following:

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{lll} \mathrm{L}(x^{-i}) & \underset{x_i, y_i}{\text{minimize}} & c_i y_{i,i} - p(\bar{y}_i) y_{i,i} \\ & \text{subject to} & y_{i,j} \in \mathrm{SOL}(\mathrm{S}(\bar{y}_i^{-j}, x_i, x^{-i})), \quad \forall\, j. \end{array}}$$

Note that while the spot-forward market problem is closely related to the hierarchical Cournot game, it has two key distinctions. First, leader $i$'s cost is a function of forward and spot decisions. Second, every leader's revenue includes the revenue from the second-level spot-market sales. As a consequence, the problem cannot be reduced to the hierarchical Cournot game, as observed by Su [43]. In related work, Shanbhag, Infanger and Glynn [38] conclude the existence of local equilibria in a regime where each firm employs a conjecture of the forward price function. Finally, in a constrained variant of the spot-forward game examined by Allaz and Vila, Murphy and Smeers [29] prove the existence of global equilibria when firm capacities are endogenously determined by trading on a capacity market and further discover that Allaz and Vila's conclusions regarding the benefits of forward markets may not necessarily hold. In electricity markets, there has been work beyond the papers mentioned above, in particular, by Henrion, Outrata, and Surowiec [19] and Escobar and Jofré [8].

**Congestion control in communication networks:** Significal effort has been applied towards the analysis of multi-user communication. Suppose $\mathcal{N} \triangleq \{1, \ldots, N\}$ denotes the set of users and $\mathcal{K} \triangleq \{K_1, \ldots, K_N\}$ represents the set of the user-specific strategy sets are denoted by $K_1, \ldots, K_N$. Given a set of user-specific flow decisions, collectively captured by $x$, the network manager solves a parametrized optimization problem given by the following:

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{lll} \text{Network}(x) \qquad\qquad & \underset{y}{\text{minimize}} & f(y;x) \\ & \text{subject to} & y \in C(x), \end{array}}$$

in which $y$ represents the network decisions (which include flow specifications etc.), $f(y;x)$ denotes the network manager's objective $f(y;x)$, and $C(x)$ represents the set of feasible allocations available to the manager, given $x$. Each user is assumed to be a leader with respect to the network manager (follower) and the resulting user problem is given by the following:

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{lll} \text{Ag}(x^{-i}) \qquad\qquad & \underset{x_i,y}{\text{maximize}} & U_i(x_i) - h(y) \\ & \text{subject to} & \begin{array}{l} x_i \in K_i \\ y \in \text{SOL}(\text{Network}(x)), \end{array} \end{array}}$$

where $h(y)$ represents the congestion cost associated with the network manager's decision $y$. We assume that every user is charged the entire cost of congestion, an assumption that is standard in such mdoels (cf. [2, 5]). Such a model represents a hierarchical generalization of the competitive model considered by Başar [5], Alpcan and Basar [2], and Yin, Shanbhag, and Mehta [45]. Notably, past work has not modeled the network manager as a separate entity but this extension has much relevance when considering the role of large, and possibly strategic, independent system providers (ISPs) in the context of network management.

We conclude this section with two observations. First, almost all of the existence results are model-specific and are not more generally applicable to the class of multi-leader multi-follower games. Second, in all of the instances surveyed above, the leader objectives admit a potential function. For instance, in hierarchical Cournot games, if the associated price functions are affine, then the resulting game is a potential multi-leader multi-follower game (cf. [28]). In the spot-forward games, the leader's objectives are dependent only on follower decisions; consequently, the payoffs are independent of competitive decisions and this can be immediately seen to be a potential multi-leader multi-follower game.

## 2.2 Conventional formulation of multi-leader multi-follower games

Let $\mathcal{N} = \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ denote the set of leaders. In the usual formulation of multi-leader multi-follower games, leader $i \in \mathcal{N}$ solves a parametrized MPEC of the following kind.

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{lll} \mathrm{L}_i(x^{-i}, y^{-i}) \qquad\qquad & \underset{x_i, y_i}{\text{minimize}} & \varphi_i(x_i, y_i; x^{-i}) \\ & & x_i \in X_i, \\ & \text{subject to} & y_i \in Y_i, \\ & & y_i \in \mathrm{SOL}(G(x_i, x^{-i}, \cdot), K(x_i, x^{-i})). \end{array}}$$

Here $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ denotes leader $i$'s strategy and we have used the usual notation

$$x^{-i} \triangleq (x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_N) \quad \text{and} \quad (\bar{x}_i, x^{-i}) \triangleq (x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, \bar{x}_i, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_N).$$

Furthermore, $y_i$ denotes the tuple of strategies of all followers with the requirement that $y_i$ be an equilibrium of the Nash game amongst the followers. Note that this Nash game is parametrized by the tuple of leader strategies $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_N)$. For each $x$, the set of follower equilibria are the solutions of the variational inequality (VI), $\mathrm{VI}(G(x, \cdot), K(x))$, and are denoted as $\mathrm{SOL}(G(x_i, x^{-i}, \cdot), K(x_i, x^{-i}))$. Henceforth we abbreviate

$$\mathcal{S}(x) \triangleq \mathrm{SOL}(G(x_i, x^{-i}, \cdot), K(x_i, x^{-i})). \tag{1}$$

We assume that the set-valued map $K$ is continuous as a set-valued map and $G$ is a continous mapping of all variables.

Though $y_i$ is not strictly within leader $i$'s control, a minimization over $y_i$ is performed by a leader who is assumed to be *optimistic*; a *pessimistic* leader would maximize over $y_i$ while minimizing over $x_i$. The sets $X_i$ and $Y_i$ represent other constraints and are assumed to be closed convex sets. For each $i$, objective function $\varphi_i$ is defined over $X \times Y$, where $X \triangleq \prod_{i=1}^N X_i$ and $Y \triangleq \prod_{i=1}^N Y_i$ and assumed to be continuous. Let $y = (y_1, \ldots, y_N)$ and $\Omega_i(x^{-i}, y^{-i})$ be the feasible region of $\mathrm{L}_i(x^{-i}, y^{-i})$, given by

$$\Omega_i(x^{-i}, y^{-i}) \triangleq \left\{ (x_i, y_i) \in \mathbb{R}^n \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{ll} x_i & \in X_i, \\ y_i & \in Y_i, \\ y_i & \in \mathcal{S}(x) \end{array} \right\}, \tag{2}$$

where $\mathbb{R}^n$ is the ambient space of the tuple $(x, y)$. Notice that, $\Omega_i(x^{-i}, y^{-i})$ is in fact independent of $y^{-i}$. However we use this notation to maintain consistency with other notation we introduce in the context of shared constraints. Let $\Omega(x, y)$ denote the Cartesian product of $\Omega_i(x^{-i}, y^{-i})$ :

$$\Omega(x, y) \triangleq \prod_{i=1}^N \Omega_i(x^{-i}, y^{-i}). \tag{3}$$

An important object in our analysis is the set $\mathcal{F}$ defined as

$$\mathcal{F} \triangleq \left\{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{lll} x_i & \in X_i, & \\ y_i & \in Y_i, & \\ y_i & \in \mathcal{S}(x), & \quad i = 1, \ldots, N \end{array} \right\}, \tag{4}$$

which is the set of tuples $(x, y)$ such that $(x_i, y_i)$ is feasible for $\mathrm{L}_i(x^{-i}, y^{-i})$ for all $i$. It is easily seen that $\mathcal{F}$ is the set of fixed points of $\Omega$, i.e. $\mathcal{F} = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n : (x, y) \in \Omega(x, y)\}$. We refer to $\Omega$ as the *feasible region mapping* and denote the EPEC associated with this multi-leader multi-follower game by $\mathscr{E}$.

**Definition 2.1 (Global Nash equilibrium)** *Consider the multi-leader multi-follower game $\mathscr{E}$. The* global Nash equilibrium*, or simply* equilibrium*, of $\mathscr{E}$ is a point $(x, y) \in \mathcal{F}$ that satisfies the following:*

$$\varphi_i(x_i, y_i; x^{-i}) \le \varphi_i(u_i, v_i; x^{-i}) \quad \forall (u_i, v_i) \in \Omega_i(x^{-i}, y^{-i}), \quad i = 1, \ldots, N. \tag{5}$$

Eq (5) says that at an equilibrium $(x, y)$, $(x_i, y_i)$ lies in the set of best responses to $(x^{-i}, y^{-i})$ for all $i$. The qualification "global" is useful in distinguishing the equilibrium from its stationary counterparts (referred to as a "Nash B-stationary", "Nash strong-stationary", etc.) or its local counterpart (referred to as a "local Nash equilibrium"). In this paper, our main focus is on global Nash equilibria and we refer to them as simply "equilibria"; other notions are qualified accordingly.

## 2.3 Intractability of the conventional formulation

At the Nash equilibrium, each player's strategy is his "best response" assuming the strategies of his opponents are held fixed. For any tuple of strategies $z = (z_1, \ldots, z_N)$, one may define a *reaction map* (set-valued in general) as

$$\mathcal{R}(z) := \prod_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{R}_i(z^{-i}),$$

where $\mathcal{R}_i(z^{-i})$ is the solution set of player $i$'s optimization problem obtained from assuming the opponent's strategies fixed at $z^{-i}$. The Nash equilibrium is a fixed point of this map. When the feasible region of each player's optimization problem is convex and independent of his opponent's strategies, and each player's objective function is convex in his own strategy, $\mathcal{R}$ is upper semicontinuous and convex-valued. Thus if the space of strategies of players, which forms the domain of $\mathcal{R}$, is also compact, Kakutani's fixed point theorem yields the existence of a Nash equilibrium.

Due to the nonconvexity of problems $\{\mathrm{L}_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{N}}$ there appears to be no simpler characterization of an equilibrium of the game $\mathscr{E}$ than through the fixed-point of its reaction map. However, difficulties arise when one attempts to apply fixed point theory to this reaction map. For game $\mathscr{E}$ the reaction map is a map $\mathcal{R} : \mathrm{dom}(\Omega) \to 2^{\mathrm{range}(\Omega)}$, where

$$\mathcal{R}(x, y) = \left\{ (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \Omega(x, y) \;\middle|\; \left. \begin{array}{ccc} \varphi_1(\bar{x}_1, \bar{y}_1; x^{-1}) & \le & \varphi_1(u_1, v_1; x^{-1}) \\ & \vdots & \\ \varphi_N(\bar{x}_N, \bar{y}_N; x^{-N}) & \le & \varphi_N(u_N, v_N; x^{-N}) \end{array} \right\} \quad \forall\, (u, v) \in \Omega(x, y) \right\}. \tag{6}$$

Almost all fixed point theorems rely on the following broad assumptions:

(a) the mapping to which a fixed point is sought is assumed to be a *self-mapping*;

(b) (i) the domain of the mapping and (ii) the images are required to be of a specific shape, e.g. convex;

(c) the mapping is required to be continuous (if the mapping is single-valued) or upper semicontinuous (if set-valued).

The first difficulty encountered is that $\mathcal{R}$ is not necessarily a self-mapping: $\mathcal{R}$ maps $\mathrm{dom}(\Omega)$ to $\mathrm{range}(\Omega)$ and $\mathrm{range}(\Omega)$ may not be a subset of $\mathrm{dom}(\Omega)$. Second, $\mathrm{dom}(\Omega)$ is hard to characterize and little can be said about its shape. Finally, the continuity (or upper semicontinuity) of $\mathcal{R}$ is far from immediate. There are ways of circumventing difficulties (a) and (b), some of which have been employed in literature. If $\Omega(x, y) \neq \emptyset$ for all $(x, y) \in X \times Y$, we have $\mathrm{dom}(\Omega) = X \times Y$ and $\mathcal{R}$ may be taken to be a map from $X \times Y$ to subsets of $X \times Y$. This approach was employed by Arrow and Debreu [3]. If $X \times Y$ is convex, as is in our case, the difficulty (b(i)) is also circumvented. The (upper semi-)continuity of $\mathcal{R}$ requires $\Omega$ to be continuous [11], a property that rarely holds if $\mathcal{S}$ (the solution set of a VI) is multivalued. As a consequence, the shape of the mapped values ((b.ii)) and the upper semicontinuity of $\mathcal{R}$ are the key barriers to the success of this approach. In the case where $\mathcal{S}$ is single-valued, the continuity of $\mathcal{R}$ follows readily. A majority of the known results for EPECs are indeed for this case.

# 3 Quasi-potential multi-leader multi-follower games

In this section, we consider a class of multi-leader multi-follower Nash games with the goal of developing sufficient conditions for the existence of equilibria. In Section 3.1, we define a new class of multi-leader multi-follower games, called *quasi-potential* games, and provide conditions for the existence of global equilibria. Analogous results for local and Nash stationary equilibria are provided in Section 3.2. Finally, in Section 3.3 we conclude by commenting on how the results apply to some well-known examples.

## 3.1 Existence results for global equilibria

To motivate quasi-potential games, let us first consider potential games. Consider the multi-leader multi-follower game $\mathscr{E}$ introduced earlier.

**Definition 3.1 (Potential multi-leader multi-follower games)** *A potential multi-leader multi-follower game is a multi-leader multi-follower game where leaders have objective functions* $\varphi_i, i \in \mathcal{N}$ *such that there exists a function* $\pi$*, called potential function, such that for all* $i \in \mathcal{N}$*, for all* $(x_i, x^{-i}) \in X, (y_i, y^{-i}) \in Y$ *and for all* $x_i' \in X_i, y_i' \in Y_i$

$$\varphi_i(x_i, y_i; x^{-i}, y^{-i}) - \varphi_i(x_i', y_i'; x^{-i}, y^{-i}) = \pi(x_i, y_i; x^{-i}, y^{-i}) - \pi(x_i', y_i'; x^{-i}, y^{-i}). \tag{7}$$

One may ask if it is true that potential multi-leader multi-follower games have equilibria? The answer is no, as demonstrated by an example of Pang and Fukushima [33] (we consider this example in Section 3.3 and revisit it in 4.1). Next let us consider the case where for each tuple of leader decisions, there is a unique follower equilibrium. In this case, the leader problem $\mathrm{L}_i$ can be reformulated as follows:

$$\boxed{\tilde{\mathrm{L}}_i(x^{-i}) \qquad \begin{array}{ll} \underset{x_i}{\text{minimize}} & \varphi_i(x_i, \mathcal{S}(x); x^{-i}) \\ \text{subject to} & x_i \in X_i, \end{array}}$$

where $\mathcal{S}(x)$ is defined in (1) as the set of follower equilibria induced by $x$. Denote this game as $\tilde{\mathscr{E}}$. We may now define an implicit potential multi-leader multi-follower game as follows.

**Definition 3.2 (Implicit Potential multi-leader multi-follower games)** *An implicit potential multi-leader multi-follower game is a multi-leader multi-follower game in which the* $i^{\text{th}}$ *leader solves* $\tilde{\mathrm{L}}_i(x^{-i})$ *and there exists a function* $\pi$*, referred to as a potential function, such that for all* $i \in \mathcal{N}$*, for all* $(x_i, x^{-i}) \in X$*, and for all* $x_i' \in X_i$

$$\varphi_i(x_i, \mathcal{S}(x); x^{-i}) - \varphi_i(x_i', \mathcal{S}(x_i', x^{-i}); x^{-i}) = \pi(x_i, \mathcal{S}(x); x^{-i}) - \pi(x_i', \mathcal{S}(x_i', x^{-i}); x^{-i}). \tag{8}$$

For an implicit potential multi-leader multi-follower game, we derive an existence statement by relating it to an associated optimization problem:

$$\boxed{\mathrm{P}^{\text{imp}} \qquad \begin{array}{ll} \underset{x}{\text{minimize}} & \pi(x) \\ \text{subject to} & x \in X. \end{array}}$$

The following proposition formalizes the relationship between the global minimizers of the above problem and the global equilibria of a potential multi-leader multi-follower game.

**Proposition 3.1** *Consider an implicit potential multi-leader multi-follower game $\tilde{\mathscr{E}}$. Then any global minimizer of $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{imp}}$ is a global Nash equilibrium of $\tilde{\mathscr{E}}$.*

**Proof :** Let $x$ be a global minimizer of $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{imp}}$. Then clearly,

$$\pi(x) \leq \pi(x') \qquad \forall x' \in X.$$

Fix $i \in \mathcal{N}$, let $\bar{x}_i \in X_i$ be arbitrary and let $x' := (\bar{x}_i, x^{-i})$. Since $X = \prod X_i$, the point $x' \in X$. Now (8) gives that

$$\varphi_i(x_i, y(x); x^{-i}) \leq \varphi_i(\bar{x}_i, y(\bar{x}_i, x^{-i}); x^{-i}).$$

Since $\bar{x}_i$ and $i \in \mathcal{N}$ were arbitrary, it follows that $x$ is an equilibrium ■

In principle, the above is an existence result. However two challenges emerge when one considers the result in practice. First, in most cases, particularly when the second-level equilibrium constraints arises from the equilibrium conditions of a constrained problem, $\mathcal{S}(\cdot)$ is not single-valued. Second, even if $\mathcal{S}(\cdot)$ is single-valued, ascertaining the potentiality of this implicit game is hard. Evidently, this ascertaining potentiality would require one to have a closed-form expression for $\mathcal{S}(\cdot)$. We now provide a different avenue that relies on defining a related, but distinct, property of *quasi-potentiality.*

**Definition 3.3 (Quasi-potential multi-leader multi-follower games)** *Consider a multi-leader multi-follower game $\mathscr{E}$ in which the player objectives are denoted by $\{\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_N\}$ and assume that $Y_1 = \ldots = Y_N = \bar{Y}$. $\mathscr{E}$ is referred to as a quasi-potential game if the following hold:*

*(i) For $i = 1, \ldots, N$, there exist functions $\phi_1(x), \ldots, \phi_N(x)$ and a function $h(x, y_i)$ such that each player $i$'s objective $\varphi_i(\cdot)$ is given as*

$$\varphi_i(x_i, y_i; x^{-i}) \equiv \phi_i(x) + h(x, y_i).$$

*(ii) There exists a function $\pi(\cdot)$ such that for all $i = 1, \ldots, N$, and for all $x \in X$ and $x_i' \in X_i$, we have*

$$\phi_i(x_i; x^{-i}) - \phi_i(x_i'; x^{-i}) = \pi(x_i; x^{-i}) - \pi(x_i'; x^{-i}).$$

*The function $\pi + h$ is called the quasi-potential function.*

Notice that we have assumed $Y_i = \bar{Y}$ for all $i$ and the function $h$ does not have a subscript '$i$', and is thereby the same for all players. Essentially a quasi-potential game has objective functions which can be a written as a sum of an '$x$' part and an '$x, y_i$' part, wherein the '$x$' part admits a potential function in the standard sense and the '$x, y_i$' part is identical for all players. There exists a function $\pi$ as required in Definition 3.3 if and only if [28] (see also Lemma 4.2) for all $x \in \prod_{i=1}^N X_i$

$$\nabla_{x_i} \pi(x) \equiv \nabla_{x_i} \phi_i(x) \qquad \forall i \in \mathcal{N}. \tag{9}$$

Consider the optimization problem $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{quasi}}$, defined as:

$\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{quasi}}$

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{x,w}{\text{minimize}} \quad & \pi(x) + h(x, w) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & (x, w) \in \mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{quasi}} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}^{\text{quasi}} \triangleq \left\{ (x,w) \in \mathbb{R}^n \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{lll} x_i & \in X_i, & i = 1,\ldots,N \\ w & \in \bar{Y} & \\ w & \in \mathcal{S}(x) & \end{array} \right\}. \tag{10}$$

Observe that $\mathcal{F}^{\text{quasi}}$ is a closed set: the constraint $w \in \mathcal{S}(x)$ is equivalent to a nonlinear equation

$$\mathbf{F}^{\text{nat}}(w;x) = 0,$$

where $\mathbf{F}^{\text{nat}}(\cdot;x)$ is the natural map of $\text{VI}(G(x,\cdot),K(x))$. Since $K,G$ have been assumed continuous (cf. immediately following (1)), it follows that the zeros of $\mathbf{F}^{\text{nat}}$ form a closed set.

Our main result relates the minimizers of $\text{P}^{\text{quasi}}$ to the global equilibria of $\mathscr{E}$. In deriving this result we exploit the fact that $\Omega_i(x^{-i},y^{-i})$ is in fact independent of $y^{-i}$ (recall the discussion following (2)). Likewise, $\varphi_i$ does not depend on $y^{-i}$. *Therefore in this section we explicitly use the notation* $\Omega_i(x^{-i}) \equiv \Omega_i(x^{-i},y^{-i})$ *and* $\text{L}_i(x^{-i},y^{-i}) \equiv \text{L}_i(x^{-i})$.

**Proposition 3.2** *Consider a quasi-potential multi-leader multi-follower game $\mathscr{E}$. Then if $(x,w)$ is a global minimizer of $\text{P}^{\text{quasi}}$, then $(x,y)$, where $y_i = w$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$, is a global equilibrium of $\mathscr{E}$.*

**Proof :** Observe that a point $(x_i,w)$ is feasible for the $i^{\text{th}}$ agent's problem $\text{L}_i(x^{-i})$ if and only if $(x,w) \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{quasi}}$. i.e.,

$$(x_i,w) \in \Omega_i(x^{-i}) \qquad \Longleftrightarrow \qquad (x,w) \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{quasi}}. \tag{11}$$

Now suppose, $(x,w)$ is a solution of $\text{P}^{\text{quasi}}$. Then,

$$\pi(x) + h(x,w) \leq \pi(x') + h(x',w'), \qquad \forall x' \in X \text{ and } w' \in S(x').$$

More specifically, taking $x' = (x'_i, x^{-i})$ and $w' \in S(x'_i,x^{-i})$, and using (11), it follows that

$$\pi(x_i;x_{-i}) + h(x,w) \leq \pi(x'_i;x_{-i}) + h((x'_i,x_{-i}),w') \qquad \forall (x'_i,w') \in \Omega_i(x^{-i}).$$

Since $\mathscr{E}$ is a quasi-potential game, $\pi(x_i,x_{-i}) - \pi(x'_i,x_{-i}) = \phi_i(x_i;x_{-i}) - \phi_i(x'_i,x_{-i})$. Let $y$ be such that $y_i = w$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$. As a result

$$\varphi_i(x_i,y_i;x^{-i}) \leq \varphi_i(x'_i,w';x^{-i}), \qquad \forall x'_i, w' \in \Omega_i(x^{-i}),$$

and hence $(x_i,y_i)$ is a solution $\text{L}_i(x^{-i})$. The result follows. ■

Given this relationship between the minimizers of $\text{P}^{\text{quasi}}$ and the equilibria of $\mathscr{E}$, existence of equilibria is guaranteed by the solvability of $\text{P}^{\text{quasi}}$, as formalized by the next result.

**Theorem 3.3 (Existence of global equilibria of $\mathscr{E}$)** *Let $\mathscr{E}$ be a quasi-potential multi-leader multi-follower game. Suppose $\mathcal{F}^{\text{quasi}}$ is a nonempty set and $\varphi_i$ is a continuous function for $i = 1,\ldots,N$. If the minimizer of $\text{P}^{\text{quasi}}$ exists (for example, if either $\pi$ is a coercive function over $\mathcal{F}^{\text{quasi}}$ or if $\mathcal{F}^{\text{quasi}}$ is compact), then $\mathscr{E}$ admits an equilibrium.*

We now consider a special case of $\mathscr{E}$ which is a quasi-potential multi-leader multi-follower game. Here the $i^{\text{th}}$ leader solves the following problem wherein the objective is independent of $y_i$ and refer to this problem as $\mathscr{E}^{\text{ind}}$.

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{lll} \text{L}_i^{\text{ind}}(x^{-i},y^{-i}) & \underset{x_i,y_i}{\text{minimize}} & \varphi_i(x_i;x^{-i}) \\ & & x_i \in X_i, \\ & \text{subject to} & y_i \in \bar{Y}, \\ & & y_i \in \mathcal{S}(x). \end{array}}$$

The following corollary captures the relationship between the global minimizers of $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{quasi}}$ and the global equilibria of $\mathscr{E}^{\mathrm{ind}}$.

**Corollary 3.4** *Consider game $\mathscr{E}^{\mathrm{ind}}$ in which for each $i$, $\varphi_i(x_i, y_i; x^{-i}) \equiv \varphi_i(x_i, x^{-i})$ and the functions $\{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{N}}$ admit a potential function. Then this game is a quasi-potential multi-leader multi-follower game and if $(x, w)$ is a global minimizer of $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{quasi}}$, then $(x, y)$ where $y_i = w$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$ is a global equilibrium of $\mathscr{E}^{\mathrm{ind}}$. If a solution exists to $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{quasi}}$, it is a global equilibrium of $\mathscr{E}^{\mathrm{ind}}$.*

At this juncture, it is worth differentiating the above existence statements from more standard results presented in [39, 43] where the follower equilibrium decisions are eliminated by leveraging the single-valuedness of the solution set of the follower equilibrium problem. In these approaches, the final claim rests on showing that the "implicitly" defined objective function is convex and continuous, properties that again require further assumption. In comparison, we do not impose any such requirement. Finally, we believe that the class of *quasi-potential games* is not an artificial construct. For instance, the congestion control games arising in communication networks clearly lead to a quasi-potential multi-leader multi-follower game.

### 3.2 Local and Nash stationary equilibria

While the discussion thus far provides an approach for claiming existence of global equilibria by obtaining a global solution to a suitable optimization problem. However, the computation of a global minimizer of $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{quasi}}$ is a difficult nonconvex problem that falls within the category of mathematical programs with equilibrium constraints (MPEC). However, one can often obtain stationary points or local minimizers of such problems and in this subsection, we relate these points to analogous local or stationarity variants of Nash equilibria. We begin with a formal definition of a Nash Bouligand stationary or a Nash B-stationary point.[1]

**Definition 3.4 (Nash B-stationary point)** *A point $(x, y) \in \mathcal{F}$ is a* Nash B-stationary point *of $\mathscr{E}$ if for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$,*

$$\nabla_i \varphi_i(x, y)^\top d \geq 0 \quad \forall d \in \mathcal{T}((x_i, y_i); \Omega_i(x^{-i})),$$

*where $\mathcal{T}(z; K)$, the tangent cone at $z \in K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, is defined as follows:*

$$\mathcal{T}(z; K) \triangleq \left\{ dz \in \mathbb{R}^n : \exists \{\tau_k\}, \{z_k\} \text{ such that } dz = \lim_{k \to \infty} \left( \frac{z_k - z}{\tau_k} \right), K \ni z_k \to z, 0 < \tau_k \to 0 \right\}.$$

**Proposition 3.5 (Nash B-stationary points of $\mathscr{E}$)** *Consider a quasi-potential multi-leader multi-follower game $\mathscr{E}$ and suppose $\varphi_i$ is a continuously differentiable function over $X_i \times \bar{Y}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, N$. If $(x, w)$ is a B-stationary point of $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{quasi}}$, then $(x, y)$ where $y_i = w$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$ is a Nash B-stationary point of $\mathscr{E}$.*

**Proof :** A stationary point $(x, w)$ of $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{quasi}}$ satisfies

$$\nabla_x(\pi(x) + h(x, w))^\top dx + \nabla_w h(x, w)^\top dw \geq 0, \quad \forall (dx, dw) \in \mathcal{T}((x, w); \mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{quasi}}). \tag{12}$$

Fix an $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and consider an arbitrary $(dx_i', dy_i') \in \mathcal{T}(x_i, w; \Omega_i(x^{-i}))$. By the definition of the tangent cone, there exists a sequence $\Omega(x^{-i}) \ni (u_{i,k}, v_{i,k}) \overset{k}{\to} (x_i, w)$ and a sequence $0 < \tau_k \overset{k}{\to} 0$ such that $\frac{u_{i,k} - x_i}{\tau_k} \overset{k}{\to} dx_i'$ and $\frac{v_{i,k} - w}{\tau_k} \overset{k}{\to} dy_i'$. It follows that the sequence $(\mathbf{x}_{i,k}, \mathbf{y}_{i,k})$, where

$$\mathbf{x}_{i,k} = (x_1, \ldots, u_{i,k}, \ldots, x_N), \text{ and } \mathbf{y}_{i,k} = v_{i,k}, \tag{13}$$

---

[1] A primal-dual characterization of B-stationarity is provided by Pang and Fukushima [34].

satisfies $(\mathbf{x}_{i,k}, \mathbf{y}_{i,k}) \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{quasi}}$. Therefore, the direction $(\mathbf{dx}_i, \mathbf{dw})$ where

$$\mathbf{dx}_i = (0, \dots, dx_i', \dots, 0) \text{ and } \mathbf{dy}_i = dy_i',$$

belongs to $\mathcal{T}((x,w); \mathcal{F}^{\text{quasi}})$. Substituting $(dx, dw) = (\mathbf{dx}_i, \mathbf{dy}_i)$ in (12) and using (9) gives

$$\nabla_{x_i}(\phi_i(x) + h(x,w))^\top dx_i' + \nabla_w h(x,w)^\top dy_i' \geq 0.$$

Since, $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $(dx_i', dy_i') \in \mathcal{T}(x_i, w; \Omega_i(x^{-i}))$ were arbitrary, $(x,w)$ is a Nash B-stationary point of $\mathscr{E}$. ■

We now define a local Nash equilibrium and show its relationship to the local minimum of $\mathrm{P}^{\text{quasi}}$.

**Definition 3.5 (Local Nash equilibrium)** *A point $(x,y) \in \mathcal{F}$ is a* local Nash equilibrium *of $\mathscr{E}$ if for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$, $(x_i, y_i)$ is a local minimum of $\mathrm{L}_i(x^{-i})$.*

**Proposition 3.6 (Local Nash equilibrium of $\mathscr{E}$)** *Consider a quasi-potential multi-leader multi-follower game $\mathscr{E}$ and suppose $\varphi_i$ is continuously differentiable function over $X_i \times \bar{Y}$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$. If $(x,w)$ is a local minimizer of $\mathrm{P}^{\text{quasi}}$, then $(x,y)$, where $y = (w, \dots, w)$ is a local Nash equilibrium of $\mathscr{E}$.*

**Proof :** If $(x,w)$ is a local minimum of $\mathrm{P}^{\text{quasi}}$, there exists a neighborhood of $(x,w)$, denoted by $\mathcal{B}(x,w)$, such that

$$\pi(x) + h(x,w) \leq \pi(x') + h(x', w'), \qquad \forall\ (x', w') \in \mathcal{B}(x,w) \cap \mathcal{F}^{\text{quasi}}. \tag{14}$$

Consider an arbitrary $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and let $\mathcal{B}_i(x_i, w; x^{-i}) := \{(u_i, v_i) \mid (u_i, x^{-i}, v_i) \in \mathcal{B}(x,w)\}$. Then by the definition of $\mathcal{F}^{\text{quasi}}$ in (10) it follows that

$$(u_i, v_i) \in \Omega_i(x^{-i}) \cap \mathcal{B}_i(x_i, w; x^{-i}) \iff (u_i, x^{-i}, v_i) \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{quasi}} \cap \mathcal{B}(x,w).$$

Thus, in (14) put $x' = (u_i, x^{-i}), w' = v_i$ to get

$$\pi(x) + h(x,w) \leq \pi(u_i, x^{-i}) + h(u_i, x^{-i}, v_i) \qquad \forall (u_i, v_i) \in \Omega_i(x^{-i}) \cap \mathcal{B}_i(x_i, w; x^{-i}).$$

Then employing (7), we get

$$\varphi_i(x,w) \leq \varphi_i(u_i, x^{-i}, v_i), \qquad \forall\ (u_i, v_i) \in \Omega_i(x^{-i}) \cap \mathcal{B}_i(x_i, w; x^{-i}).$$

In other words, $(x_i, w)$ is a local minimizer of $\mathrm{L}_i(x^{-i})$. This holds for each $i \in \mathcal{N}$, whereby $(x,y)$ where $y = (w, \dots, w)$ is a local Nash equilibrium. ■

**Remark :** For sake for brevity we have chosen to focus only on the Nash B-stationary points and local Nash equilibria. Similar relationships hold also between other notions of stationarity. □

### 3.3 Revisiting the example of Pang and Fukushima [33]

In 2005, Pang and Fukushima [33] presented an example of a simple multi-leader multi-follower game that had no equilibrium. This game has two leaders with objectives $\varphi_1$ and $\varphi_2$, defined as follows:

$$\varphi_1(x_1, y_1) = \tfrac{1}{2}x_1 + y_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_2(x_2, y_2) = -\tfrac{1}{2}x_2 - y_2.$$

It can be observed that this game is a potential game, but is not a quasi-potential game. However, several variants of this game with a modified $\varphi_2$ have an equilibrium, since they turn out to be quasi-potential games. For example, in a particular variant, the leader objectives are given as follows:

$$\varphi_1(x_1, y_1) = \tfrac{1}{2}x_1 + y_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_2(x_2, y_2) = -\tfrac{1}{2}x_2 + y_2,$$

and this game has an equilibrium. We discuss the original example and the variants next.

**Example 3.1. Pang and Fukushima [33]** Consider a multi-leader multi-follower game comprising of two leaders and one follower [33]. Suppose $X_1 = X_2 = [0, 1]$ and $Y = \mathbb{R}$. The lone follower is assumed to solve the optimization problem

$$\min_{y \geq 0} \left\{ y(-1 + x_1 + x_2) + \tfrac{1}{2}y^2 \right\} = \max\left\{0, 1 - x_1 - x_2\right\}$$

Each leader has an objective function independent of the strategies of the other leader.

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{lll} \mathrm{L}_1(x_2) & \underset{x_1, y_1}{\text{minimize}} & \varphi_1(x_1, y_1) = \frac{1}{2}x_1 + y_1 \\ & \text{subject to} & \begin{array}{l} x_1 \in [0, 1] \\ y_1 = \max\{0, 1 - x_1 - x_2\} \end{array} \end{array}} \quad \boxed{\begin{array}{lll} \mathrm{L}_2(x_1) & \underset{x_2, y_2}{\text{minimize}} & \varphi_2(x_2, y_2) = -\frac{1}{2}x_2 - y_2 \\ & \text{subject to} & \begin{array}{l} x_2 \in [0, 1] \\ y_2 = \max\{0, 1 - x_1 - x_2\} \end{array} \end{array}}$$

By substituting for $y_1$, it can be observed that $\mathrm{L}_1(x_2)$ is a convex problem for any $x_2$. However $\mathrm{L}_2(x_1)$ is not a convex problem and can be rewritten as the following nonsmooth nonconvex program:

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{lll} \mathrm{L}_2(x_1) & \underset{x_2}{\text{minimize}} & \min\left(-\frac{1}{2}x_2, -1 + x_1 - \frac{1}{2}x_2\right) \\ & \text{subject to} & x_2 \in [0, 1]. \end{array}}$$

The resulting reaction maps in the $(x_1, x_2)$ space are given by the following:

$$\mathcal{R}_1(x_2) = \{1 - x_2\} \;\; \forall x_2 \in [0, 1] \text{ and } \mathcal{R}_2(x_1) = \begin{cases} \{0\} & x_1 \in [0, \frac{1}{2}) \\ \{0, 1\} & x_1 = \frac{1}{2} \\ \{1\} & x_2 \in (\frac{1}{2}, 0]. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see $\mathcal{R}_2$ is not upper semicontinuous and that $\mathcal{R}$ has no fixed point. Thus, this game has no equilibrium. □

Observe that this game admits a potential function in the $(x, y)$ space given readily by:

$$\pi(x, y) = \varphi_1(x_1, y_1) + \varphi_2(x_2, y_2) = \tfrac{1}{2}x_1 + y_1 - \tfrac{1}{2}x_2 - y_2.$$

However this game is *not* a quasi-potential game, since, clearly, one cannot find a function $h$ such that $h(x, y_1) = y_1$ and $h(x, y_2) = -y_2$ to meet the requirement of Definition 3.3. We now consider a modification of this example.

**Example 3.2. Quasi-potential variants of Pang and Fukushima [33]** Consider the following variant of the Pang and Fukushima example:

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{lll} \mathrm{L}_1(x_2) & \underset{x_1, y_1}{\text{minimize}} & \varphi_1(x_1, y_1) = \frac{1}{2}x_1 + h(y_1) \\ & \text{subject to} & \begin{array}{l} x_1 \in [0, 1] \\ y_1 = \max\{0, 1 - x_1 - x_2\} \end{array} \end{array}} \quad \boxed{\begin{array}{lll} \mathrm{L}_2(x_1) & \underset{x_2, y_2}{\text{minimize}} & \varphi_2(x_2, y_2) = -\frac{1}{2}x_2 + h(y_2) \\ & \text{subject to} & \begin{array}{l} x_2 \in [0, 1] \\ y_2 = \max\{0, 1 - x_1 - x_2\}, \end{array} \end{array}}$$

where $h(\cdot)$ is a continuous function. Notice that the Pang and Fukushima example is not a special case of this game. However this game is a quasi-potential game, with quasi-potential function given by $\pi(x)+h(y) = \frac{1}{2}x_1 - \frac{1}{2}x_2 + h(y)$. By Proposition 3.2, a global minimizer of $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{quasi}}$ is a global equilibrium of the $\mathscr{E}$, where $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{quasi}}$ is defined as

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{lll} \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{quasi}} \; \underset{x_1,x_2,w}{\text{minimize}} & & \frac{1}{2}x_1 - \frac{1}{2}x_2 + h(w) \\ \qquad\text{subject to} & & \begin{array}{r} w = \max\{0, 1-x_1-x_2\}, \\ x_1, x_2 \in [0,1]. \end{array} \end{array}}$$

Let us consider some special cases of $h$:

- Take $h(w) \equiv w$. In this case, in $\mathrm{L}_1$, $\mathrm{L}_2$, one may substitute $y_1$ and $y_2$, resulting in agents problem $\tilde{\mathrm{L}}_1, \tilde{\mathrm{L}}_2$ in $x_1, x_2$, with objectives,

  $$\tilde{\varphi}_1(x_1,x_2) = \tfrac{1}{2}x_1 + \max\{0, 1-x_1-x_2\}, \qquad \tilde{\varphi}_2(x_1,x_2) = -\tfrac{1}{2}x_1 + \max\{0, 1-x_1-x_2\},$$

  respectively. Notice that $\tilde{\varphi}_1, \tilde{\varphi}_2$ are convex in $x_1$ and $x_2$ respectively. Since the feasible regions of both problems is compact (they are unit intervals) and the objective is convex and continuous, classical results give that this game has an equilibrium.

- Take $h(w) \equiv -w$. In this case, again one may substitute for $y_1, y_2$ in terms of $x_1, x_2$. The resulting problems $\tilde{\mathrm{L}}_1$ and $\tilde{\mathrm{L}}_2$ are nonconvex. Notice that $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{quasi}}$ is equivalent to minimizing $\frac{1}{2}x_1 - \frac{1}{2}x_2 - \max\{0, 1-x_1-x_2\}$ over $\{(x_1,x_2) : (x_1,x_2) \in [0,1]^2\}$. It can be observed that the minimizer of $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{quasi}}$ is given by $(x_1, x_2, w) = (0,0,1)$. To see why the point $(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2) = (0,0,1,1)$ is an equilibrium, notice that given $x_2 = 0, y_2 = 1$, the global minimizer of $\mathrm{L}_1(x_2, y_2)$ is $x_1 = 0, y_1 = 1$. Similarly, with $x_1 = 0, y_1 = 1$, the global minimizer of $\mathrm{L}_2(x_1, y_1)$ is given by $x_2 = 0, y_2 = 1$.

$\square$

Thus we have seen that quasi-potentiality is a powerful property that allows one to leverage the unique structure of multi-leader multi-follower games to claim existence of equilibria.

# 4 Potential games and shared constraint modifications

In Section 3, we presented existence statements for a class of multi-leader multi-follower games given by implicit potential and quasi-potential games. Yet, these cases do not cover all classes of games. In this section, we develop a broader result, albeit for a modified version of the problem. We begin by making a general observation regarding how a broad a result one may expect. Since we already know of instances of simple multi-leader multi-follower games that do not admit equilibria (the example of Pang and Fukushima [33] being a case in point), an existence result that applies for all games is unreasonable to expect. Considering that a kind of potentiality has been leveraged in the results of Section 3, one may hope to extend the theory sufficiently to cover at least potential games. But here too one encounters the roadblock observed in the Pang and Fukushima [33] example – this game is a potential game and it does not have equilibria. In this section, we consider a modification of the conventional formulation to arrive at a related game that has the same objective functions as the original game but a particular constraint structure called a *shared constraints*. We show that if the objective functions admit a potential function, the new games with these modifications have equilibria under mild conditions. The resulting formulation is weaker in the sense that equilibria of the original game are equilibria of this modified formulation, but the converse is not true.

## 4.1 Another look at the Pang and Fukushima example [33]

To motivate the results of this section, we consider again the example of Pang and Fukushima [33] and analyze a modified version of this example that captures the spirit of the modified formulation we make. In this section we revert back to the notation $\Omega_i(x^{-i}, y^{-i})$ and $\mathrm{L}_i(x^{-i}, y^{-i})$.

**Example 4.3. A modified version of the Pang and Fukushima example [33]:** As noted in Example 3.1, this example is a potential game in the space of $(x, y)$ and does not admit an equilibrium. In Example 3.1 we considered variants where the objective of one leader was modified to give a quasi-potential game which did admit an equilibrium. Here, we retain the objectives of the original problem and instead add *constraints*, to arrive at new game which is shown to admit an equilibrium.

Consider the following modification of the Pang and Fukushima example. The key difference is that now leader 1 also has an additional constraint, '$y_2 = \max\{0, 1 - x_1 - x_2\}$', which in the original problem appeared in leader 2's optimization problem. Likewise, leader 2 now has an additional constraint '$y_1 = \max\{0, 1 - x_1 - x_2\}$', which in the original problem, was in leader 1's optimization problem. More specifically,

- *both leaders* are constrained by *both equilibrium constraints*;
- Leader $i$'s problem is parametrized the decisions of *rival leaders* (denoted by $x^{-i}$) and *the other leader's conjectures about the follower equilibrium* (denoted by $y^{-i}$).

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{lrl} \mathrm{L}_1(x_2, y_2) \underset{x_1, y_1}{\text{minimize}} & \varphi_1(x_1, y_1) = & \frac{1}{2}x_1 + y_1 \\ & x_1 \in & [0,1] \\ \text{subject to} & y_1 = & \max\{0, 1 - x_1 - x_2\} \\ & y_2 = & \max\{0, 1 - x_1 - x_2\} \end{array}}$$

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{lrl} \mathrm{L}_2(x_1, y_1) \underset{x_2, y_2}{\text{minimize}} & \varphi_2(x_2, y_2) = & -\frac{1}{2}x_2 - y_2 \\ & x_2 \in & [0,1] \\ \text{subject to} & y_1 = & \max\{0, 1 - x_1 - x_2\} \\ & y_2 = & \max\{0, 1 - x_1 - x_2\} \end{array}}$$

We claim that $((x_1, x_2), (y_1, y_2)) = ((0, 1), (0, 0))$ is an equilibrium of this modified game. To see why this is true, observe the objectives of the two leaders at equilibrium. Leader 1 gets $\varphi_1(0, 0) = 0$ whereas leader 2 gets $\varphi_2(1, 0) = -\frac{1}{2}$. Leader 1's global minimum is 0 and he thus has no incentive to deviate from this strategy. Leader 2's strategy set at equilibrium reduces to a singleton containing only his equilibrium strategy. This is induced by the presence of leader 1's equilibrium constraint in his optimization problem (the constraint $y_1 = \max\{0, 1 - x_1, x_2\}$ is, at equilibrium, equivalent to $0 = \max\{0, 1 - x_2\}$; together with the constraint $x_2 \in [0, 1]$ this implies $x_2 = 1$ and $y_2 = 0$.) We thus see that the additional constraints introduced in each leader's problem facilitate the existence of an equilibrium. $\square$

Our aim in this section is to generalize the approach adopted in this example. The modified game we have considered has the special constraint structure called a *shared constraint*. Later, it is shown ( Theorem 4.3) that a potential game with shared constraints admits an equilibrium under mild conditions. Indeed a result analogous to Prop. 3.2 holds: the global minimizers of the potential function over the shared constraint are equilibria of this game. In this game, the shared constraint is given by the set

$$\mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{ae}} = \left\{ (x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2) \,\middle|\, (x_1, x_2) \in [0, 1]^2, (y_1, y_2) \geq 0, \quad \begin{array}{l} y_1 = \max\{0, 1 - x_1 - x_2\} \\ y_2 = \max\{0, 1 - x_1 - x_2\} \end{array} \right\}.$$

We will explain the notation $\mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ in the following sections. The game admits a potential function:

$$\pi(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2) = \varphi_1(x_1, y_1) + \varphi_2(x_2, y_2) = \tfrac{1}{2}x_1 + y_1 - \tfrac{1}{2}x_2 - y_2.$$

The global minimizer of $\pi$ over $\mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ is

$$\arg \min_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{ae}}} \tfrac{1}{2}x_1 + y_1 - \tfrac{1}{2}x_2 - y_2 = ((0, 1), (0, 0)),$$

which is the equilibrium.

## 4.2 Background and modifications leading to a shared-constraint game

Shared-constraint games were introduced by Rosen [35] as a generalization of the classical Nash game. In a shared-constraint game, there exists a set $\mathbb{C}$ in the product space of strategies such that the constraints faced by the players are as follows: for any player $i$, and for any tuple of strategies of other players (denoted $z^{-i}$), the feasible strategies $z_i$ for player $i$ are those that satisfy $(z_i, z^{-i}) \in \mathbb{C}$. In an $N$-person shared-constraint Nash game with player payoffs denoted by $\{f_1, \ldots, f_N\}$, player $i$ solves:

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{lll} \mathrm{A}_i(z^{-i}) & \underset{z_i}{\text{minimize}} & f_i(z_i; z^{-i}) \\ & \text{subject to} & (z_i, z^{-i}) \in \mathbb{C} \end{array}}$$

An equilibrium $z = (z_1, \ldots, z_N)$ satisfies the following:

$$z \in \mathbb{C}, \quad f_i(z_1, \ldots, z_N) \le f_i(z_1, \ldots, \bar{z}_i, \ldots, z_N) \qquad \forall\ \bar{z}_i \text{ s.t. } (z_1, \ldots, \bar{z}_i, \ldots, z_N) \in \mathbb{C}, \quad \forall\ i \in \mathcal{N}. \tag{15}$$

Equivalently [17], $z$ is an equilibrium if $z \in \Omega^{\mathbb{C}}(z)$ and for all $i$

$$f_i(z_1, \ldots, z_N) \le f_i(z_1, \ldots, \bar{z}_i, \ldots, z_N) \qquad \forall\ \bar{z}_i \in \Omega_i^{\mathbb{C}}(z^{-i}),$$

where

$$\Omega^{\mathbb{C}}(z) \triangleq \prod_{i=1}^{N} \Omega_i^{\mathbb{C}}(z^{-i}) \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_i^{\mathbb{C}}(z^{-i}) \triangleq \left\{ \bar{z}_i \mid (\bar{z}_i; z^{-i}) \in \mathbb{C} \right\}.$$

A more detailed background about shared-constraint games is in Appendix A. The feasible region mapping $\Omega$ defined in (3) (where $\Omega_i(x^{-i}, y^{-i})$ is the feasible region of $\mathrm{L}_i(x^{-i}, y^{-i})$) is a shared constraint if $\Omega$ has the following structure: for $(x, y)$ in the domain of $\Omega$,

$$(u, v) \in \Omega(x, y) \iff (u_i, x^{-i}, v_i, y^{-i}) \in \mathcal{F} \quad \forall\ i \in \mathcal{N}. \tag{16}$$

(Recall that $\mathcal{F}$ was defined in (4) and is the set of fixed points of $\Omega$). It is easy to check that this condition does not hold in general for the mapping $\Omega$, whereby $\mathscr{E}$ is in general not a shared constraint game. Multi-leader multi-follower games bear a natural resemblance to shared-constraint games: each leader in such a game is constrained by the equilibrium amongst the *same* set of followers. In fact, the $i^{\text{th}}$ equilibrium constraints represent the $i^{\text{th}}$ *leader's conjecture of follower decisions.* However, in EPEC $\mathscr{E}$ we see that the feasible region mapping $\Omega$ defined in (3) is not necessarily a shared constraint (i.e. it does not satisfy (16)). We now present a modification of the conventional formulation for which the resulting game has shared constraints.

**Modification: Leaders sharing all equilibrium constraints:** Consider the formulation in which the $i^{\text{th}}$ leader solves the following optimization problem.

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{llll} \mathrm{L}_i^{\text{ae}}(x^{-i}, y^{-i}) & \underset{x_i, y_i}{\text{minimize}} & \varphi_i(x_i, y_i; x^{-i}) & \\ & & x_i \in X_i, & \\ & \text{subject to} & y_i \in Y_i, & \\ & & y_j \in \mathcal{S}(x), & j = 1, \ldots, N. \end{array}}$$

We denote this game by $\mathscr{E}^{\text{ae}}$ and note that the difference between $\mathscr{E}^{\text{ae}}$ and $\mathscr{E}$ is that *all* constraints $y_j \in \mathcal{S}(x)$, $j = 1, \ldots, N$ are now a part of *each* leader's optimization problem (thus the superscript "ae"). In effect, each leader takes into account the conjectures regarding the follower equilibrium made by all other leaders. The result is that for any $i$, $y_i$ satisfies the same constraints in problems $\mathrm{L}_i$ and $\mathrm{L}_i^{\text{ae}}$, but $x_i$ is constrained by additional constraints in $\mathrm{L}_i^{\text{ae}}$.

For $y_j \in Y_j, x_j \in X_j$ for $j \neq i$, let $\Omega_i^{\rm ae}(x^{-i}, y^{-i})$ be the feasible region of $\mathrm{L}_i^{\rm ae}(x^{-i}, y^{-i})$ and let $\Omega^{\rm ae}, \mathcal{F}^{\rm ae}, \mathcal{S}^N$ and $\mathcal{G}$ be defined as

$$\Omega^{\rm ae}(x,y) \triangleq \prod_{i=1}^{N} \Omega_i^{\rm ae}(x^{-i}, y^{-i}), \qquad \mathcal{F}^{\rm ae} \triangleq \{(x,y) \mid (x,y) \in \Omega^{\rm ae}(x,y)\}, \tag{17}$$

$$\mathcal{S}^N(x) \triangleq \prod_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{S}(x), \qquad \mathcal{G} \triangleq \{(x,y) \mid y \in \mathcal{S}^N(x)\}, \tag{18}$$

where $\mathcal{G}$ is the graph of $\mathcal{S}^N$ and $\mathcal{F}^{\rm ae}$ is the set of fixed points of $\Omega^{\rm ae}$. An equilibrium of $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$ is a point

$$(x,y) \in \mathcal{F}^{\rm ae}, \text{ such that } \quad \varphi_i(x_i, y_i; x^{-i}) \leq \varphi_i(\bar{x}_i, \bar{y}_i; x^{-i}) \qquad \forall\ (\bar{x}_i, \bar{y}_i) \in \Omega_i^{\rm ae}(x^{-i}, y^{-i}), \forall i.$$

The modification $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$ is weaker than $\mathscr{E}$ in the sense that an equilibrium of $\mathscr{E}$ is an equilibrium of $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$, as formalized next.

**Proposition 4.1** *Consider the multi-leader multi-follower game defined by $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$. Then the following hold:*

*(i) The mapping $\Omega^{\rm ae}(x,y)$ is a shared constraint mapping satisfying* (16)*;*

*(ii) A point $(x,y)$ is a fixed point of $\Omega^{\rm ae}$ if and only if it is a fixed point of $\Omega$. i.e., $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}^{\rm ae}$;*

*(iii) Every equilibrium of $\mathscr{E}$ is an equilibrium of $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$.*

**Proof :**

(i) It can be seen that for any $i$ and any $x^{-i}, y^{-i}$, where $x_j \in X_j, y_j \in Y_j$ for all $j \neq i$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_i^{\rm ae}(x^{-i}, y^{-i}) &= \{x_i, y_i \mid x_i \in X_i, y_i \in Y_i, y_j \in \mathcal{S}(x) \text{ for } j = 1, \ldots, N\} \\ &= \{x_i, y_i \mid x_i \in X_i, y_i \in Y_i, y \in \mathcal{S}^N(x)\}. \end{aligned}$$

But $y_j \in Y_j, x_j \in X_j$ for $j \neq i$, implying that

$$\begin{aligned} \{x_i, y_i \mid x_i \in X_i, y_i \in Y_i, y \in \mathcal{S}^N(x)\} &= \{x_i, y_i \mid x_i \in X_i, y_j \in Y_j \text{ for } j = 1, \ldots, N, y \in \mathcal{S}^N(x)\} \\ &= \{x_i, y_i \mid x \in X, y \in Y, (x,y) \in \mathcal{G}\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{G}$ is defined in (18). Thus $\Omega^{\rm ae}$ is a shared constraint of the form dictated by (16).

(ii) It suffices to show that $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}^{\rm ae}$. But, from (i) it follows that $\mathcal{F}^{\rm ae} = (X \times Y) \cap \mathcal{G}$, and it is also seen that $\mathcal{F}$ equals $(X \times Y) \cap \mathcal{G}$. The result follows.

(iii) An equilibrium $(x,y)$ of $\mathscr{E}$ lies in $\mathcal{F}$ and thereby in $\mathcal{F}^{\rm ae}$. Since $\Omega_i^{\rm ae}(x^{-i}, y^{-i}) \subseteq \Omega_i(x^{-i}, y^{-i})$, the result follows.

■

A special case of a game $\mathscr{E}$ which is already a shared-constraint game is the following. Consider a multi-leader multi-follower game, denoted by $\mathscr{E}^{\rm bl}$, in which the leaders solve bilevel optimization problems. Specifically, in such a game, the $i^{\rm th}$ leader solves the following parametrized problem:

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{lll} \mathrm{L}_i^{\rm bl}(x^{-i}) \qquad\qquad & \underset{x_i, y_i}{\text{minimize}} & \varphi_i(x_i, y_i; x^{-i}) \\ & & x_i \in X_i, \\ & \text{subject to} & y_i \in \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_i(x_i), \\ & & y_i \in Y_i. \end{array}}$$

Since $y_i \in \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_i(x_i)$, there is no coupling of leader decisions in the constraints of leader problems. This is a special case of $\mathscr{E}$ with $\mathcal{S}(x) \equiv \prod_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_i(x_i)$, where $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_i(x)$ is the solution of a variational inequality for each $i$ and where the objective of leader $i$ depends only on the equilibrium of $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_i(x)$ and not on $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_j(x)$ for $j \neq i$. With a slight abuse of our notation so far, we let $y_i$ denote an element of the set $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_i(x_i)$ and $Y_i$ be the space of such $y_i$. Let $\Omega_i^{\rm bl}$ be the feasible region of $\mathrm{L}_i^{\rm bl}(x^{-i}, y^{-i})$ and let $\mathcal{F}^{\rm bl}$ be the set of fixed points of $\Omega^{\rm bl} \triangleq \prod_{i=1}^N \Omega_i^{\rm bl}$. Since there is no coupling, it is easily seen that

$$\mathcal{F}^{\rm bl} = \Omega^{\rm bl} = \{(x, y) \mid x \in X, y \in \tilde{Y}, (x, y) \in \widehat{\mathcal{G}}\},$$

where $\widehat{\mathcal{G}} = \prod_{i=1}^N \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_i$, $\tilde{Y} \triangleq \prod_{i=1}^N Y_i$, and $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_i$ is the graph of $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_i$. If $(x_j, y_j) \in \Omega_j^{\rm bl}$, for $j \neq i$,

$$\Omega_i^{\rm bl} = \{(x_i, y_i) \mid x_i \in X_i, y_i \in Y_i, y_i \in \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_i(x_i)\} = \{(x_i, y_i) \mid (x, y) \in \mathcal{F}^{\rm bl}\}.$$

It follows that this game is a shared constraint game.

In the following section we present the existence results for the games $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$, but since the only property we use is the shared constraint structure, our results apply also to $\mathscr{E}^{\rm bl}$.

## 4.3 Potential games and existence of global equilibria

We present existence statements for $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$, the shared constraint variant of multi-leader multi-follower models. We emphasize that this formulation is an EPEC – i.e., in this formulation, the optimization problem of each leader is indeed constrained by an equilibrium constraint – and it is thus a hard problem in its own right.

The existence results of this section pertain to potential multi-leader multi-follower games [28], which were defined in Definition 3.1. If $\varphi_i$ is a continuously differentiable function for $i = 1, \ldots, N$, then it follows [28] that $\pi$ is continuously differentiable. In this case $\pi$ is a potential function if and only if

$$\nabla_i \varphi_i(x_i, y_i; x^{-i}, y^{-i}) = \nabla_i \pi(x_i, y_i; x^{-i}, y^{-i}) \qquad \forall\ x, y, \forall\ i, \tag{19}$$

where $\nabla_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial(x_i, y_i)}$. i.e., if and only if the mapping

$$F \triangleq (\nabla_1 \varphi_1, \ldots, \nabla_N \varphi_N) \tag{20}$$

is integrable. The following lemma follows from a well known characterization of integrable mappings.

**Proposition 4.2** *Consider a multi-leader multi-follower game in which the objective functions $\varphi_i, i \in \mathcal{N}$ of the leaders are continuously differentiable. Then the game is a potential game if and only if for all $(x, y) \in X \times Y$, the Jacobian $\nabla F(x, y)$ is a symmetric matrix.*

Our main result relates the equilibria of potential multi-leader multi-follower games with shared constraints, and the global minimizers of the potential function over the shared constraint, i.e., of the following MPEC:

$$\mathrm{P}^{\rm ae} \qquad \begin{array}{ll} \underset{x,y}{\text{minimize}} & \pi(x, y) \\ \text{subject to} & (x, y) \in \mathcal{F}^{\rm ae}. \end{array}$$

Arguing as we did for $\mathcal{F}^{\rm quasi}$, we find that $\mathcal{F}^{\rm ae}$ is a closed set.

**Theorem 4.3 (Minimizers of $\mathrm{P}^{\rm ae}$ and Equilibria of $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$)** *Let $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$ be a potential multi-leader multi-follower game with a potential function $\pi$. Then any global minimizer of $\pi$ over $\mathcal{F}^{\rm ae}$ is an equilibrium of $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$.*

**Proof :** Let $(x,y) \in \mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ be a global minimum of $\pi$ over $\mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{ae}}$. Then, for each $i \in \mathcal{N}$

$$\pi(x_i, y_i, x^{-i}, y^{-i}) - \pi(u_i, v_i, x^{-i}, y^{-i}) \leq 0 \quad \forall\ (u_i, v_i) : (u_i, v_i, x^{-i}, y^{-i}) \in \mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{ae}}.$$

But, $(u_i, v_i, x^{-i}, y^{-i}) \in \mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ if and only if $(u_i, v_i) \in \Omega_i^{\mathrm{ae}}(x^{-i}, y^{-i})$, since $\Omega^{\mathrm{ae}}$ is a shared constraint. Using this, together with the fact that $\pi$ is a potential function, we obtain that for each $i$

$$\varphi_i(x_i, y_i; x^{-i}, y^{-i}) - \varphi_i(u_i, v_i; x^{-i}, y^{-i}) \leq 0 \quad \forall\ (u_i, v_i) \in \Omega_i^{\mathrm{ae}}(x^{-i}, y^{-i}).$$

This implies that for $i = 1, \ldots, N$, given $(x^{-i}, y^{-i})$, the vector $(x_i, y_i)$ lies in the set of best responses for leader $i$. In other words, $(x, y)$ is an equilibrium of $\mathscr{E}^{\mathrm{ae}}$. ■

Having developed a relationship between the minimizers of the potential function and the equilibria of multi-leader multi-follower games, it follows that if the minimizer of $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ exists, the game $\mathscr{E}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ admits an equilibrium. Following is our existence result for $\mathscr{E}^{\mathrm{ae}}$.

**Theorem 4.4 (Existence of equilibria of $\mathscr{E}^{\mathrm{ae}}$)** *Let $\mathscr{E}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ be a potential multi-leader multi-follower game with a potential function $\pi$. Suppose $\mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ is a nonempty set and $\varphi_i(x)$ is a continuous function for $i = 1, \ldots, N$. If the minimizer of $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ exists (for example, if either $\pi$ is a coercive function on $\mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ or if $\mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ is compact), then $\mathscr{E}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ admits an equilibrium.*

**Proof :** It is easy to see from (7) that $\pi$ is continuous. By the hypothesis of the theorem, $\pi$ achieves its global minimum on $\mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{ae}}$. This could, for instance, be deduced from the coercivity of $\pi$ over a nonempty set $\mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ or by the compactness of $\mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ Based on Theorem 4.3, a global minimizer of $\pi$ is an equilibrium of $\mathscr{E}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ and the result follows. ■

**Remark :** Recall that $\mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{ae}} = \mathcal{F}$. Therefore $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ is essentially a minimization of $\pi$ over $\mathcal{F}$. Furthermore, note that these results apply also to $\mathscr{E}^{\mathrm{bl}}$. □

All multi-leader multi-follower games when modified to a shared constraint form may not admit equilibria. That the leader objectives must admit a potential function is a crucial requirement. If the objectives of the leaders are independent of the strategies of other leaders, the sum of the objectives is a potential function, whereby any such game is a potential game. We thus have the following corollary.

**Corollary 4.5** *Consider a multi-leader multi-follower game $\mathscr{E}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ for which $\mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ is nonempty and $\varphi_i, i \in \mathcal{N}$ are continuous. Assume further that for each $i \in \mathcal{N}$, $\varphi_i(x_i, y_i; x^{-i}) \equiv \varphi_i(x_i, y_i)$, i.e., assume that $\varphi_i$ is independent of $x^{-i}$. If, either the functions $\varphi_i, i \in \mathcal{N}$ are coercive or if $\mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ is compact, the game $\mathscr{E}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ has an equilibrium.*

**Proof :** If $\varphi_i(x_i, y_i; x^{-i}) \equiv \varphi_i(x_i, y_i)$ for each $i$, $\pi = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \varphi_i$ is a potential function. Then by Theorem 4.3, the game has an equilibrium. ■

### 4.4 Stationary points of the potential function and Nash stationary equilibria

In general, the global minimization of $\pi$ over $\mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ is hindered by the nonconvexity of $\mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ as well as the possible nonconvexity of $\pi$. When solved computationally, standard nonlinear programming solvers may only produce a suitably defined stationary point of $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{S}}$. Traditionally, while a range of stationarity points are considered in the context of MPECs [36], we focus on two notions – Bouligand stationarity and local minimizers of $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{ae}}$. In this section, we relate these stationary points and local minimizers to their equilibrium counterparts in the context of $\mathscr{E}^{\mathrm{ae}}$. Appendix B covers other notions of stationarity.

**Proposition 4.6 (B-Stationary points of $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ and Nash B-stationary points of $\mathscr{E}^{\mathrm{ae}}$)** *Consider the multi-leader multi-follower game $\mathscr{E}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ and suppose $\{\varphi_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{N}}$ are continuously differentiable functions over $X \times Y$ that admit a potential function $\pi$. If $(x, y)$ is a B-stationary point of $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{ae}}$, then $(x, y)$ is a Nash B-stationary point of $\mathscr{E}^{\mathrm{ae}}$.*

**Proof :** A stationary point $(x, y)$ of $\pi$ over $\mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ satisfies

$$\nabla_x \pi(x, y)^\top dx + \nabla_y \pi(x, y)^\top dy \geq 0, \quad \forall (dx, dy) \in \mathcal{T}((x, y); \mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{ae}}). \tag{21}$$

Fix some $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and consider an arbitrary $(dx'_i, dy'_i) \in \mathcal{T}(x_i, y_i; \Omega_i^{\mathrm{ae}}(x^{-i}, y^{-i}))$. By the definition of the tangent cone, there exists a sequence $\Omega^{\mathrm{ae}}(x^{-i}, y^{-i}) \ni (u_{i,k}, v_{i,k}) \xrightarrow{k} (x_i, y_i)$ and a sequence $0 < \tau_k \xrightarrow{k} 0$ such that $\frac{u_{i,k}-x_i}{\tau_k} \xrightarrow{k} dx'_i$ and $\frac{v_{i,k}-y_i}{\tau_k} \xrightarrow{k} dy'_i$. It follows that the sequence $(\mathbf{x}_{i,k}, \mathbf{y}_{i,k})$, where

$$\mathbf{x}_{i,k} = (x_1, \ldots, u_{i,k}, \ldots, x_N), \text{ and } \mathbf{y}_{i,k} = (y_1, \ldots, v_{i,k}, \ldots, y_N), \tag{22}$$

satisfies $(\mathbf{x}_{i,k}, \mathbf{y}_{i,k}) \in \mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{ae}}$. Therefore, the direction $(\mathbf{dx}_i, \mathbf{dy}_i)$ where

$$\mathbf{dx}_i = (0, \ldots, dx'_i, \ldots, 0) \text{ and } \mathbf{dy}_i = (0, \ldots, dy'_i, \ldots, 0),$$

belongs to $\mathcal{T}(z; \mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{ae}})$. Substituting $(dx, dy) = (\mathbf{dx}_i, \mathbf{dy}_i)$ in (21) and using that $\pi$ is a potential function gives

$$\nabla_{x_i} \varphi_i(x, y)^\top dx'_i + \nabla_{y_i} \varphi_i(x, y)^\top dy'_i \geq 0.$$

Since, $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $(dx'_i, dy'_i) \in \mathcal{T}(x_i, y_i; \Omega_i^{\mathrm{ae}}(x^{-i}, y^{-i}))$ were arbitrary, $(x, y)$ is a Nash B-stationary point of $\mathscr{E}^{\mathrm{ae}}$. ■

**Proposition 4.7 (Local minimum of $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ and local Nash equilibrium)** *Consider the multi-leader multi-follower game $\mathscr{E}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ with potential function $\pi$. If $(x, y)$ is a local minimum of $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{ae}}$, then $(x, y)$ is a local Nash equilibrium of $\mathscr{E}^{\mathrm{ae}}$.*

**Proof :** The proof is analogous to that of Theorem 4.3. If $(x, y)$ is a local minimum of $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{ae}}$, there exists a neighborhood of $(x, y)$, denoted by $\mathcal{B}(x, y)$, such that

$$\pi(x, y) \leq \pi(x', y'), \qquad \forall\ (x', y') \in \mathcal{B}(x, y) \cap \mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{ae}}. \tag{23}$$

Consider an arbitrary $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and let $\mathcal{B}_i(x_i, y_i; x^{-i}, y^{-i}) := \{(u_i, v_i) \mid (u_i, v_i, x^{-i}, y^{-i}) \in \mathcal{B}(x, y)\}$. Then it follows that

$$(u_i, v_i) \in \left(\Omega_i^{\mathrm{ae}}(x^{-i}, y^{-i}) \cap \mathcal{B}_i(x_i, y_i; x^{-i}, y^{-i})\right) \iff (u_i, v_i, x^{-i}, y^{-i}) \in \left(\mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{ae}} \cap \mathcal{B}(x, y)\right).$$

Thus, using this relation in (23) and employing (7), we get

$$\varphi_i(x, y) \leq \varphi_i(u_i, v_i, x^{-i}, y^{-i}), \qquad \forall\ (u_i, v_i) \in \left(\Omega_i^{\mathrm{ae}}(x^{-i}, y^{-i}) \cap \mathcal{B}_i(x_i, y_i; x^{-i}, y^{-i})\right).$$

In other words, $(x_i, y_i)$ is a local minimizer of $\mathrm{L}_i^{\mathrm{ae}}(x^{-i}, y^{-i})$. This holds for each $i \in \mathcal{N}$, whereby $(x, y)$ is a local Nash equilibrium. ■

**Remark 4.1. (Relationship to variational equilibria in convex shared constraint games)** The $\mathscr{E}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ has shared constraints. In the convex setting, the games are typically referred to as generalized Nash games and equilibria of such games are referred to as generalized Nash equilibria (GNE). The *variational equilibrium* or VE is referred to as a GNE in which the Lagrange multipliers, corresponding to the shared constraints, are equal across players. These multipliers can be interpreted as the shadow prices of the associated constraints. Furthermore, when these prices are equal, the equilibria can be viewed as corresponding to a uniform auction price while disparities in prices may be a consequence of discriminatory prices. The above observations form the basis of a detailed study of the VE and the GNE which is the subject of Kulkarni and Shanbhag [24]. There it is shown that under general conditions, if a GNE exists a VE also exists, in which case the VE is said to be a *refinement* of the GNE [37, 4].

A VE can also be characterized by the solution of a variational inequality $\mathrm{VI}(\mathbb{C}, F)$, where $\mathbb{C}$ is the shared constraint and for objective functions $\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_N$, the mapping $F$ is defined in (20). Now for potential games with potential function $\pi$, $F \equiv \nabla\pi$, whereby $\mathrm{VI}(\mathbb{C}, F)$ is equivalent to $\mathrm{VI}(\mathbb{C}, \nabla\pi)$. Thus in a potential game with shared constraints, every VE is also a stationary point of the potential function over the shared constraint. Coming back to the game $\mathscr{E}^{\mathrm{ae}}$, a stationary point of $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ is therefore akin to a something like a VE of this formulation. Finally, on a side note, recall that Leyffer and Munson [26] also employ consistent multipliers for follower responses in their *price consistent formulations.* □

## 4.5 Relation between modified and conventional formulations

In this section, we provide some intuition for the relationship between various equilibria arising from the shared constraint modification. We begin by considering a game in which player $i$ has strategies $x_i, y_i$, objective $f_i(x_i, y_i; x^{-i})$ and a nonlinear constraint $h(x, y_i) \geq 0$, where $h(\cdot)$ is concave and $f_i(x_i, y_i; x^{-i})$ is convex in $x_i, y_i$, for each $x^{-i}$. Specifically, player $i$ solves.

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{llll} \mathrm{A}_i(x^{-i}) & \underset{x_i, y_i}{\text{minimize}} & f_i(x_i, y_i; x^{-i}) & \\ & \text{subject to} & h(x, y_i) \geq 0. & (\lambda_1) \end{array}}$$

We refer to this game as $G$. Suppose $\mathrm{A}_i(x^{-i})$ is a convex optimization problem for each $x^{-i}$. The shared constraint modification of this problem akin to the "ae" formulation is given by the following:

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{llll} \mathrm{A}_i^{\mathrm{ae}}(x^{-i}, y^{-i}) & \underset{x_i, y_i}{\text{minimize}} & f_i(x_i, y_i; x^{-i}) & \\ & & h(x, y_1) \geq 0 & (\lambda_{11}) \\ & \text{subject to} & \vdots & \\ & & h(x, y_N) \geq 0. & (\lambda_{1N}) \end{array}}$$

Notice that since $h(\cdot)$ is concave, $\mathrm{A}_i^{\mathrm{ae}}(x^{-i}, y^{-i})$ is a convex optimization problem. Denote this game as $G^{\mathrm{ae}}$. Our first result relates equilibria of $G$ to that of $G^{\mathrm{ae}}$:

**Proposition 4.8** *The point $(x, y)$ is an equilibrium of $G$ with multipliers $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_N$ if and only if $(x, y)$ is an equilibrium of $G^{\mathrm{ae}}$ with*

$$\lambda_{ii} = \lambda_i \text{ and } \lambda_{ij} = 0, \forall j \neq i. \tag{24}$$

**Proof :** By the same logic as in Prop, 4.1 (iii), any equilibrium of $G$ is an equilibrium $G^{\mathrm{ae}}$. Since problems $A_i, i \in \mathcal{N}$, and $A_i^{\mathrm{ae}}, i \in \mathcal{N}$, are convex optimization problems, the aggregated KKT conditions of individual players are necessary and sufficient for $(x, y)$ to be an equilibrium of $G$ and $G^{\mathrm{ae}}$, respectively. (24) now follows from a examination of the KKT conditions. ■

In effect, the multiplier set provides a characterization of the subset of equilibria of $G^{\mathrm{ae}}$ that are equilibria of $G$. Naturally, not every equilibrium of $G^{\mathrm{ae}}$ will abide by such a requirement; yet, this suggests the equilibrium selection problem if one were interested in equilibria of $G$:

$$\text{find} \quad (x, y, \lambda) \quad \text{such that the equilibrium conditions hold and } \lambda_{ij} = 0, \qquad \forall i, j, i \neq j.$$

This motivates the utility of shared constraint formulations.

1. *Pathways to existence statements:* The shared constraint formulation admits a larger set of equilibria, that includes equilibria of the conventional formulation (if they exist). We have seen that under mild assumptions, existence of equilibrium akin to variational equilibria can be guaranteed. This may be a stepping stone towards developing an approach for claiming existence of equilibria of $\mathscr{E}$.

2. *Tools for equilibrium computation and selection:* Equilibrium computation is a crucial concern in the design of markets, a realm where such problems routinely arise. Yet, such designs are plagued by a key challenge in that equilibria are not readily computable. If the objectives admit a potential function, this formulation provides two crucial benefits. First, it allows for computing global variational equilibria through the solution of a single optimization problem. Second, if one takes the view that the conventional formulation is the "correct" formulation, the modification may provide a means to arriving at an equilibrium of the conventional formulation, provided it exists.

## 5 A hierarchical Cournot game

In this section, we present a multi-leader multi-follower game from [39] which is a hierarchical Cournot game. When formulated in the conventional form it has an equilibrium. Through this game, we will demonstrate the validity of Propositions 4.1 and Theorem 4.3. Below, we modify this game in the form of $\mathscr{E}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ and show that the claim made in Proposition 4.1 holds: the equilibrium of this game is also an equilibrium of its modification. The example also casts light on why existence of equilibria to games with shared constraints is more easily guaranteed. The equilibrium conditions of $\mathscr{E}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ have more variables, and thus allow for more "degrees of freedom" for their satisfaction. Cournot games, as noted in Section 2.1, admit potential functions. We then calculate the minimizer of the potential function of this game (i.e., the solution of $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{ae}}$) and show that it is an equilibrium of the modified game, thereby verifying Theorem 4.3.

**Example 5.4.** Let $\mathscr{E}$ be a game with $N$ *identical* leaders and $n$ *identical* followers. The follower strategies conjectured by leader $i$ are denoted by $\{y_i^f\}_{f=1,\ldots,n}$ (we use $f$ to index followers) and we let $\bar{y}_i^{-f}$ denote $\sum_{j \neq f} y_i^j$. Leader $i$ solves the following parametrized problem:

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{lll} \mathrm{L}_i(x^{-i}, y^{-i}) \qquad & \underset{x_i, y_i}{\text{minimize}} & \frac{1}{2}cx_i^2 - x_i\left(a - b(x_i + \sum_{j \neq i} x_j + \sum_{f=1}^{n} y_i^f)\right) \\ & \text{subject to} & y_i^f = \mathrm{SOL}(\mathrm{F}(\bar{y}_i^{-f}, x_i, x^{-i})), \quad \forall\, f, \\ & & x_i \geq 0, \end{array}}$$

where $y_i^f \in \mathbb{R}$ is the conjecture of leader $i$ of the equilibrium strategy of follower $f$. Follower $f$ solves the problem $(\mathrm{F}(\bar{y}^{-f}, x))$:

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{lll} \mathrm{F}(\bar{y}^{-f}, x) & \underset{y^f}{\text{minimize}} & \frac{1}{2}c(y^f)^2 - y^f \left(a - b(y^f + \sum_{j \neq f} y^j + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} x_i)\right) \\ & \text{subject to} & y_f \geq 0, \end{array}}$$

where constants $a, b, c$ are positive real numbers. Since these constants are the same for all followers, equilibrium strategies of all followers are equal. Consequently the follower equilibrium tuple conjectured by leader $i$ is given by $y_i = (\widehat{y}_i, \ldots, \widehat{y}_i)$, where $\widehat{y}_i$ satisfies $\widehat{y}_i \in \mathrm{SOL}(\mathrm{F}((n-1)\widehat{y}_i, x))$ (since $\bar{y}^{-f} = (n-1)\widehat{y}_i$). For any $x$, there is a unique $\widehat{y}_i$ that satisfies this relation, given by

$$\widehat{y}_i = \begin{cases} (a - b\sum_j x_j)/(c + b(n+1)) & \text{if } 0 \leq \sum_j x_j \leq a/b, \\ 0 & \text{if } \sum_j x_j > a/b. \end{cases} \tag{25}$$

By considering only the first of above cases in (25), we get a restricted game where leader $i$ solves

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{llll} \mathrm{L}_i'(x^{-i}, \widehat{y}^{-i}) & \underset{x_i, \widehat{y}_i}{\text{minimize}} & \frac{1}{2}cx_i^2 - x_i \left[a - b\left(x_i + \sum_{j \neq i} x_j + n\widehat{y}_i\right)\right] & \\ & & \widehat{y}_i = \frac{a - b\sum_j x_j}{c + b(n+1)}, & : \bar{\lambda}_i \\ & \text{subject to} & \sum_j x_j \leq a/b, & : \bar{\mu}_i \\ & & x_i \geq 0. & \end{array}}$$

This is a generalized Nash game with coupled but not shared constraints. However, since the optimization problems of the leaders are convex (this is not obvious; see [39, Lemma 1] for a proof), we may use the first-order KKT conditions to derive an equilibrium. Let $\bar{\lambda}_i$ be the Lagrange multiplier corresponding the constraint "$\widehat{y}_i = \frac{a - b\sum_j x_j}{c + b(n+1)}$". The equilibrium conditions of this game are

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} 0 \leq x_i \perp (c+b)\, x_i - a + b\left(\displaystyle\sum_j x_j + n\widehat{y}_i\right) + \dfrac{b}{c + b(n+1)}\bar{\lambda}_i + \bar{\mu}_i \geq 0, \\ \qquad \widehat{y}_i = \dfrac{a - b\sum_j x_j}{c + b(n+1)}, \\ 0 \leq \bar{\mu}_i \perp a/b - \displaystyle\sum_j x_j \geq 0, \\ \qquad 0 = nbx_i + \bar{\lambda}_i. \end{array} \right\} \forall\, i \in \mathcal{N}. \tag{26}$$

We can verify that the tuple $x = x^*$ where all leaders play the same strategy $\widehat{x}$, i.e. $x_i^* = \widehat{x}$ for all $i$ with $\widehat{x}$ given by

$$\widehat{x} = \frac{a(b+c)}{b(b+c)(N+1) + c(b+c) + bcn},$$

satisfies equilibrium conditions for the restricted game $\{\mathrm{L}_i'\}_{i \in \mathcal{N}}$. The optimal Lagrange multiplier is given by $\bar{\lambda}_i^* = -nbx_i^*, \bar{\mu}_i^* = 0$. It can then be verified that this equilibrium also satisfies the requirement $\sum_i x_i^* < a/b$, whereby it is an equilibrium of the original game. The other case of $\widehat{y}_i = 0$ does not result in an equilibrium that satisfies $\sum_i x_i > a/b$, and consequently $x^*$ is the only equilibrium.

**Verifying Proposition 4.1 (An equilibria of $\mathscr{E}$ is an equilibrium of $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$):** Let us now consider this game modified as $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$.

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{lll} \mathrm{L}_i^{\rm ae}(x^{-i}, y^{-i}) & \underset{x_i, y_i}{\text{minimize}} & \frac{1}{2}cx_i^2 - x_i(a - b(x_i + \sum_{j\neq i} x_j + \sum_{f=1}^{n} y_i^f)) \\ & \text{subject to} & \begin{array}{l} y_k^f = \mathrm{SOL}(\mathrm{F}(\bar{y}_k^{-f}, x_k, x^{-k})), \quad \forall\, f, \forall\, k = 1, \dots, N \\ x_i \geq 0. \end{array} \end{array}}$$

Notice that the equilibrium constraint is now for all $f$ and for all $k$. For any $k$, the equilibrium constraint may be simplified using (25), giving an equation in $\widehat{y}_k$. It is easy to check that this game also admits no equilibrium with $\sum_j x_j > a/b$. Thus, this game is equivalent to the game where $\sum_j x_j$ is constrained to be in $[0, a/b]$. For such values of $\sum_j x_j$, the first case of (25) applies, and it gives us a game where leader $i$ solves

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{lll} \mathrm{L}_i^{\rm ae}(x^{-i}, \widehat{y}^{-i}) & \underset{x_i, y_i}{\text{minimize}} & \frac{1}{2}cx_i^2 - x_i\left[a - b\left(x_i + \sum_{j\neq i} x_j + n\widehat{y}_i\right)\right] \\ & \text{subject to} & \begin{array}{lll} \widehat{y}_k = \frac{a - b\sum_j x_j}{c + b(n+1)}, & : \lambda_i^k, & k = 1, \dots, N \\ \sum_j x_j \leq a/b, & : \mu_i, & \\ x_i \geq 0. & & \end{array} \end{array}}$$

This is a generalized Nash game with (convex) shared constraints and convex optimization problems for leaders. Let $\lambda_i^k$ be the Lagrange multiplier corresponding to the constraint "$\widehat{y}_k = \frac{a - b\sum_j x_j}{c + b(n+1)}$" in the problem $\mathrm{L}_i$. The equilibrium conditions for the generalized Nash equilibrium (see [24]) of this game are

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} 0 \leq x_i \perp (b + c)x_i - a + b\left(\displaystyle\sum_j x_j + n\widehat{y}_i\right) + \dfrac{b}{c + b(n+1)} \displaystyle\sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda_i^j + \mu_i \geq 0, \\ \qquad \widehat{y}_i = \dfrac{a - b\sum_j x_j}{c + b(n+1)}, \\ 0 \leq \mu_i \perp a/b - \displaystyle\sum_j x_j \geq 0, \\ \qquad 0 = nbx_i + \lambda_i^i, \end{array} \right\} \forall\, i \in \mathcal{N}. \tag{27}$$

Notice that the Lagrange multipliers $\lambda_i^j$ for $j \neq i$ are unconstrained barring their presence in the first condition of (27). Comparing (27) and (26), we see that if $\bar{\lambda}^*, x^*$ solve system (26), then $x = x^*$ and $\lambda_i^j = \bar{\lambda}_i^* \mathbb{I}_{\{j=i\}}$ for all $i, j \in \mathcal{N}$ gives a solution to system (27). Consequently, an equilibrium of the original game $\mathscr{E}$ is an equilibrium of $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$. We have thereby verified Proposition 4.1 for this problem.

The presence of surplus Lagrange multipliers provides us with more variables than the number of equations, whereby existence of solutions is easier to guarantee. An equilibrium of $\mathscr{E}$ is an equilibrium of the modified game $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$ with a specific configuration of the vector of Lagrange multipliers. Consequently, if an equilibrium exists to $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$, there is no guarantee that there exists one to the original game $\mathscr{E}$.

**Verifying Theorem 4.3 (Global minimizer of $\pi$ is an equilibrium of $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$):** Applying the same arguments as before, we can effectively consider the strategies of leader $i$ in game $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$ as $x_i$ and $\widehat{y}_i$. Further, suppose the function $\pi$ is given by

$$\pi(x, \widehat{y}) = \tfrac{1}{2}c\sum_i x_i^2 - a\sum_i x_i + b\left(\sum_i x_i^2 + \sum_{i<j} x_i x_j\right) + nb\sum_i x_i\widehat{y}_i,$$

where $\widehat{y} \triangleq (\widehat{y}_1, \dots, \widehat{y}_N)$. Notice that the map $F$ (cf., Lemma 4.2) is given by

$$F(x, \widehat{y}) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \varphi_i}{\partial x_i} \\ \frac{\partial \varphi_i}{\partial \widehat{y}_i} \end{pmatrix}_{i \in \mathcal{N}} = \begin{pmatrix} (b+c)x_i - a + b\left(\sum_j x_j + n\widehat{y}_i\right) \\ nbx_i \end{pmatrix}_{i \in \mathcal{N}},$$

and that $\nabla \pi \equiv F$, whereby $\pi$ is a potential function for $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$. The set $\mathcal{F}^{\rm ae}$ for this game is

$$\mathcal{F}^{\rm ae} = \{(x, \widehat{y}) \mid x \geq 0,\ \widehat{y}_i \text{ satisfies (25) } \forall\ i\}.$$

We now determine the global minimizer of $\pi$ over $\mathcal{F}^{\rm ae}$. A significant difficulty in characterizing the global minimizer of $\pi$ is that $\pi$ is not necessarily convex (despite the convexity of the objectives of leaders in their own variables).

We argue as follows. By membership of $(x, \widehat{y})$ in $\mathcal{F}^{\rm ae}$, we either have $\widehat{y}_i = \frac{a - b\sum_j x_j}{c + b(n+1)}$ for all $i$ or we have $\widehat{y}_i = 0$ for all $i$. Substituting for $\widehat{y}$, we can write $\pi$ as a function only of $x$ (with a slight abuse of notation)

$$\pi(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}c\sum_i x_i^2 - a\sum_i x_i + b\left(\sum_i x_i^2 + \sum_{i<j} x_i x_j\right) + nb\frac{a - b\sum_i x_i}{c + b(n+1)}\sum_i x_i & \text{if } 0 \leq \sum_i x_i \leq a/b, \\ \frac{1}{2}c\sum_i x_i^2 - a\sum_i x_i + b\left(\sum_i x_i^2 + \sum_{i<j} x_i x_j\right) & \text{if } \sum_i x_i > a/b. \end{cases}$$

By symmetry, the values $x_i$ that minimize $\pi$ are equal for all $i$. Let $x_i = x'$ for all $i$ be the minimizer. Then,

$$\pi(x') = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}Ncx'^2 - aNx' + b\left(Nx'^2 + \frac{N(N-1)}{2}x'^2\right) + nb\frac{a - bNx'}{c + b(n+1)}Nx' & \text{if } 0 \leq x' \leq a/(Nb), \\ \frac{1}{2}Ncx'^2 - aNx' + b\left(Nx'^2 + \frac{N(N-1)}{2}x'^2\right) & \text{if } x' > a/(Nb). \end{cases}$$

The right hand derivative of $\pi$ at $x' = a/b$ is positive, $\nabla\pi(x')^+|_{x'=a/b} = N[\frac{ac}{Nb} - a + a(N+1)] > 0$. Furthermore $\pi$ is increasing and coercive for $x' > a/(Nb)$, and consequently the minimizer of $\pi$ lies in $[0, a/(Nb)]$. Since $x'$ is a global minimizer of $\pi$, $x'$ necessarily satisfies the first-order KKT conditions for the minimization of $\pi$ over $[0, a/(Nb)]$:

$$\begin{aligned} &0 \leq x' \perp N\left((b+c)x' - a + bNx' + nb\frac{a - bNx'}{c + b(n+1)} - \frac{nb^2Nx'}{c + b(n+1)}\right) + \mu' \geq 0, \\ &0 \leq \mu' \perp a/(Nb) - x' \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

where $\mu'$ is the Lagrange multiplier for the constraint '$a/(Nb) - x' \geq 0$'. If $x', \mu'$ is a solution of system (28), then $x_i = x'$, $\mu_i = \mu'$ and $\lambda_i^j = -nbx_j = -nbx'$ for all $i, j \in \mathcal{N}$, solves system (27) for the equilibrium of $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$. Consequently $x = (x', \dots, x')$ is an equilibrium of $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$. This verifies Theorem 4.3.

It should be emphasized that we have claimed that a solution to the concatenated first-order KKT conditions of the minimization of $\pi$ over $\mathcal{F}^{\rm ae}$ is a global equilibrium of $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$, a claim that is valid because the leader problems in $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$ have been reduced to convex problems. In the case where $\mathcal{S}$ is single-valued (as it was in this example), this is possible because we could argue that for values $(x, y)$ of interest, the equation $y = \mathcal{S}(x)$ is linear in $x, y$. $\square$

## 6 Conclusions

In this paper, we considered a multi-leader multi-follower game and examined the existence of a global equilibrium. A standard approach requires ascertaining when the reaction map admits fixed points.

However, this avenue has several hindrances, an important one being the lack of continuity in the solution set associated with the equilibrium constraints capturing the follower equilibrium.

We observed that these challenges can be circumvented when the leaders objectives admit a potentiality property. First, we introduced the notion of *quasi-potential* games where any global minimizer of a suitably defined optimization problem is an equilibrium of the game. Second, in more general problems we observed that a modified formulation in which each player is constrained by the equilibrium constraints of all players contains the equilbria of the original game when this game does indeed admit equilibria, Furthermore, this game admits a shared constraint structure. In such a setting, we showed that when the leaders' objectives admit a potential function, the set of global minimizers of the potential function over the shared constraint are the equilibria of the modified multi-leader multi-follower game.

In effect, the above results reduced a question of the existence of an equilibrium to that of the solvability of an optimization problem, in particular an MPEC. This solvability can be claimed under fairly standard conditions that are tractable and verifiable – e.g., coercive objective over a nonempty feasible region – and the existence of a global equilibrium was seen to follow. We further showed that local minima and B-stationary points of the respective MPECs are local Nash equilibria and Nash B-stationary points of the corresponding multi-leader multi-follower game. We concluded with an application of our findings on a multi-leader multi-follower symmetric Cournot game.

# Appendices

## A Additional background on shared-constraint games

Shared constraint games can be extended to *coupled constraint games* in which the constraints are not necessarily shared. In such a game, an equilibrium is a point $z$ such that

$$z \in \prod_{i=1}^{N} \Omega_i^{\mathrm{NS}}(z^{-i}), \qquad f_i(z_1, \ldots, z_N) \leq f_i(z_1, \ldots, \bar{z}_i, \ldots, z_N) \qquad \forall\ \bar{z}_i \in \Omega_i^{\mathrm{NS}}(z^{-i}), \quad \forall\ i \in \mathcal{N}.$$

Here $\Omega_i^{\mathrm{NS}}$ is *any* convex-valued set-valued map, not necessarily of the form of a shared constraint. The key difference between $\Omega^{\mathrm{NS}}$ and $\Omega^{\mathbb{C}}$ is that $\Omega^{\mathbb{C}}$ is completely defined by its fixed point set, given by $\mathbb{C}$, whereas $\Omega^{\mathrm{NS}}$ is not. However in both cases, the equilibrium is a point that lies in the fixed point set (given by $\cap_{i=1}^{N}\mathbb{C}_i$ for $\Omega^{\mathrm{NS}}$, where $\mathbb{C}_i$ is the graph of $\Omega_i^{\mathrm{NS}}$). The shared-constraint game is a special case of this with $\mathbb{C}_i = \mathbb{C}_j = \mathbb{C} = \cap_k \mathbb{C}_k$ for all $i, j, k$.

Shared constraint games arise naturally when players face a common constraint, e.g. in a bandwidth sharing game, and are an area of flourishing recent research; see [10, 24]. Less is known in literature about coupled constraint games without shared constraint even with convex constraints. On the contrary, much has been said about shared constraint games when the common constraint $\mathbb{C}$ is convex (see particularly, the works of Rosen [35], Facchinei et al. [9], Kulkarni and Shanbhag [24, 25, 23] and Facchinei and Pang [13]). Therefore it is tempting to conjecture that in the case where the $\Omega$ is a shared constraint the multi-leader multi-follower game will be more amenable to a general theoretical treatment.

## B Other notions of stationarity

Here we relate other notions of stationarity for $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ with weaker equilibrium notions of $\mathscr{E}^{\mathrm{ae}}$.

When the algebraic form of the constraints are available, a *strong-stationary point* can be defined. Let $X_i = \{x_i | c_i(x_i) \geq 0\}, Y_i = \{y_i | d_i(y_i) \geq 0\}$, where $c_i, d_i$ are continuously differentiable. Let $\mathcal{S}(x)$ be the solution of a complementarity problem: $y_i \in \mathcal{S}(x) \iff 0 \le y_i \perp G(y_i; x) \ge 0$, and $G$ is $\mathbb{R}^p$-valued and continuously differentiable. Thus $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ can be written as

$$\begin{array}{|llll|}\hline \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{ae}} & \underset{x,y}{\text{minimize}} & \pi(x,y) & \\ & \text{subject to} & \left\{\begin{array}{l} c_i(x_i) \ge 0 \\ d_i(y_i) \ge 0 \\ 0 \le y_i \perp G(y_i, x) \ge 0 \end{array}\right\} & i = 1, \ldots, N. \\ \hline \end{array}$$

To define the stationarity conditions, we define the relaxed nonlinear program below which requires specifying the index sets $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{1i}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{2i}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, N$ where $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{1i}, \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{2i} \subseteq \{1, \ldots, p\}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{1i} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{2i} = \{1, \ldots, p\}$.

$$\begin{array}{|llll|}\hline \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{ae}}_{rnlp} & \underset{x,y}{\text{minimize}} & \pi(x,y) & \\ & \text{subject to} & \left\{\begin{array}{rl} c_i(x_i) \ge 0 & \\ d_i(y_i) \ge 0 & \\ [y_i]_j = 0, & \forall j \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{2i}^{\perp} \\ [G(y_i, x)]_j = 0, & \forall j \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{1i}^{\perp} \\ [y_i]_j \ge 0, & \forall j \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{1i} \\ [G(y_i, x)]_j \ge 0, & \forall j \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{2i} \end{array}\right\} & i = 1, \ldots, N, \\ \hline \end{array}$$

where $[\cdot]_j$ denotes the $j^{\text{th}}$ component of '$\cdot$' and $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{1i}^{\perp}, \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{2i}^{\perp}$ denote the complements of $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{1i}, \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{2i}$ respectively. Further, we refer to the both index sets colllectively as $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_i$ and the collection of index sets $\{\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_1, \ldots, \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_N\}$ by $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}$. Note that in accordance with [15], we define the index sets independent of the point $(x, y)$. We may now state the strong stationarity conditions at a particular point $(x, y)$.

**Definition B.1 (Strong-stationarity point of $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{ae}}$)** *A point $(x, y) \in \mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ is a* strong stationarity point *of* $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ *if there exist Lagrange multipliers $\eta_i, \mu_i, \lambda_i$ and $\beta_i, i \in \mathcal{N}$ such that the following conditions hold:*

$$\left\{\begin{array}{r} \nabla_{x_i}\pi(x,y) - \nabla_{x_i}c_i(x_i)^\top \eta_i - \displaystyle\sum_{k=1}^{N} \nabla_{x_i}G(y_i,x)^\top \beta_k = 0 \\ \nabla_{y_i}\pi(x,y) - \nabla_{y_i}d_i(y_i)^\top \mu_i - \lambda_i - \nabla_{y_i}G(y_i,x)^\top \beta_i = 0 \\ 0 \le \eta_i \perp c_i(x_i) \ge 0 \\ 0 \le \mu_i \perp d(y_i) \ge 0 \\ y_i \ge 0, \\ [\lambda_i]_j [y_i]_j = 0, \quad \forall j \\ G(y_i, x) \ge 0, \\ [\beta_i]_j [G(y_i,x)]_j = 0, \quad \forall j \\ [y_i]_j = 0 \ \mathit{or}\ [G(y_i,x)]_j = 0, \quad \forall j \\ \mathit{if}\ [G(y_i,x)]_j = 0\ \mathit{and}\ [y_i]_j = 0,\ \mathit{then}\ [\lambda_i]_j, [\beta_i]_j \ge 0, \quad \forall j. \end{array}\right\}, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{N}. \tag{29}$$

Having defined the strong stationarity conditions, we are now in a position to define the second-order sufficiency conditions. These assume relevance in defining a local Nash equilibrium; loosely speaking, at a local Nash equilibrium, every agent's decision satisfies the MPEC-second-order sufficiency or the MPEC-SOSC conditions, given the decisions of its competitors. Furthermore, corresponding to a stationary point of $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{ae}}_{rnlp}$, we may prescribe an active set $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(x,y)$ such that $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(x,y) \triangleq \{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_1(x,y),\ldots,\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_N(x,y)\}$, where $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_i(x,y)$ denotes the set of active constraints corresponding to the set of constraints

$$\left\{\begin{aligned} c_i(x_i) &\geq 0 & \\ d_i(y_i) &\geq 0 & \\ [y_i]_j &= 0, & \forall j \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{2i}^{\perp} \\ [G(y_i,x)]_j &= 0, & \forall j \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{1i}^{\perp} \\ [y_i]_j &\geq 0, & \forall j \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{1i} \\ [G(y_i,x)]_j &\geq 0, & \forall j \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{2i} \end{aligned}\right\}.$$

Suppose $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_i(x,y) = \{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_i^c(x,y), \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_i^d(x,y), \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_i^e(x,y)\}$, where $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_i^c$, $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_i^d$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_i^e$ denote the active sets associated with $c_i(x_i) \geq 0$, $d_i(y_i) \geq 0$, and the remaining constraints, respectively. The specification of the active set allows us to define the critical cone $S^*(x,y)$ as

$$S^*(x,y) \triangleq \left\{s : s \neq 0, \nabla\pi(x,y)^\top s = 0, a_j^\top s = 0, j \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(x,y), a_j^\top s \geq 0, j \notin \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(x,y)\right\}, \qquad (30)$$

where $a_j$ denotes the constraint gradients of the $j^{\text{th}}$ constraint.

**Definition B.2 (Second-order Strong-stationarity point of $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{ae}}$)** *A point $(x,y)$ of the optimization problem $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ is a* second-order strong stationary point *of $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ if it is a strong stationary point with Lagrange multipliers $(\eta,\mu,\lambda,\beta)$ and $s^T\nabla^2_{x,y}\mathcal{L}\ s > 0$ for $s \in S^*(x,y)$, where $S^*(x,y)$ is given by* (30) *and $\nabla^2_{x,y}\mathcal{L}$ denotes the Hessian of the Lagrangian of $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{ae}}_{rnlp}$ with respect $(x,y)$ evaluated at $(x,y,\eta,\mu,\lambda,\beta)$.*

Next, we provide a formal definition of *Nash strong-stationary* and *Nash second-order strong-stationary points* of $\mathscr{E}^{\mathrm{ae}}$, which requires defining the critical cone $S_i^*(x,y)$ for each leader $i = 1,\ldots,N$:

$$S_i^*(x,y) \triangleq \left\{s_i : s_i \neq 0, \nabla_i\varphi_i(x,y)^\top s_i = 0, a_j^\top s_i = 0, j \in \mathcal{A}_i(x,y), a_j^\top s_i \geq 0, j \notin \mathcal{A}_i(x,y)\right\}, \qquad (31)$$

where $\mathcal{A}_i(x,y)$[2] denotes the active set utilized in defining the relaxed nonlinear program associated with $\mathrm{L}_i^{\mathrm{ae}}(x^{-i},y^{-i})$ and $a_j$ denotes the constraint gradient associated with $j^{\text{th}}$ constraint.

**Definition B.3 (Nash strong-stationary and Nash second-order strong-stationary points)** *A point $(x,y) \in \mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ is a Nash strong-stationary point of $\mathscr{E}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ if for $i = 1,\ldots,N$, there exist Lagrange mul-*

---

[2] The active set associated with $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{ae}}_{rnlp}$ is denoted by $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ while the active set associated with leader $i$'s problems is denoted by $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_i$.

*tipliers* $\bar{\eta}_i, \bar{\mu}_i, \bar{\lambda}_i$ *and* $\bar{\beta}_i^k, k = 1, \ldots, N$*, such that the following conditions hold:*

$$\left\{\begin{array}{r}
\nabla_{x_i}\varphi_i(x,y) - \nabla_{x_i}c_i(x_i)^\top\bar{\eta}_i - \displaystyle\sum_{k=1}^{N}\nabla_{x_i}G(y_i,x)^\top\bar{\beta}_i^k = 0 \\
\nabla_{y_i}\varphi_i(x,y) - \nabla_{y_i}d_i(y_i)^\top\bar{\mu}_i - \bar{\lambda}_i - \nabla_{y_i}G(y_i,x)^\top\bar{\beta}_i^i = 0 \\
0 \leq \bar{\eta}_i \perp c_i(x_i) \geq 0 \\
0 \leq \bar{\mu}_i \perp d(y_i) \geq 0 \\
y_i \geq 0, \\
[\bar{\lambda}_i]_j[y_i]_j = 0, \quad \forall j \\
G(y_i,x) \geq 0, \\
[\bar{\beta}_i^k]_j[G(y_i,x)]_j = 0, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{N}, \forall j \\
[y_i]_j = 0 \ \textit{or}\ [G(y_i,x)]_j = 0, \quad \forall j \\
\textit{if}\ [G(y_i,x)]_j = 0 \ \textit{and}\ [y_i]_j = 0,\ \textit{then}\ [\bar{\lambda}_i]_j, [\bar{\beta}_i^k]_j \geq 0, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{N}, \forall j,
\end{array}\right\}, \forall i \in \mathcal{N}. \tag{32}$$

*Furthermore,* $(x,y)$ *is a Nash second-order strong stationary point of* $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$ *if* $(x,y)$ *is a Nash strong stationary point of* $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$ *and if for* $i = 1, \ldots, N$, $s_i^T\nabla^2_{x_i,y_i}\mathcal{L}_i(x,y)s_i > 0$ *for* $s_i \in S_i^*(x,y)$ *where* $S_i^*(x,y)$ *is given by* (31)*, where* $\nabla^2_{x_i,y_i}\mathcal{L}_i$ *denotes the Hessian of the Lagrangian function of* $\mathrm{L}_i^{\rm ae}(x^{-i}, y^{-i})$ *with respect to* $(x_i, y_i)$ *evaluated at* $(x_i, y_i, \bar{\eta}_i, \bar{\mu}_i, \bar{\lambda}_i, \bar{\beta}_i^1, \ldots, \bar{\beta}_i^N)$ *if* $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae} = \mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$ *or at* $(x_i, y_i, \bar{\eta}_i, \bar{\mu}_i, \bar{\lambda}_i, \bar{\beta}_i)$ *if* $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae} \in \{\mathscr{E}^{\rm ind}, \mathscr{E}^{\rm bl}\}$ *or at* $(x_i, y_i, \bar{\eta}_i, \bar{\mu}_i, \bar{\lambda}_i, \bar{\gamma}_i, \bar{\beta}_i)$ *if* $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae} = \mathscr{E}^{\rm cc}$.

Having defined the relevant objects, we now show that a strong-stationary point of $\mathrm{P}^{\rm ae}$ is a Nash strong-stationary point of $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$ and a second-order strong-stationary point of $\mathrm{P}^{\rm ae}$ is a second-order strong-stationary point of $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$. For $i = 1, \ldots, N$, one may define a corresponding relaxed NLP associated with the $i^{\rm th}$ leader's problem, namely $\mathrm{L}_i^{\rm ae}(x^{-i}, y^{-i})$, by employing the index sets $\mathcal{I}_i$. These index sets are defined using $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ and are given by[3] $\mathcal{I}_i = \{\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_1, \ldots, \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_N\}$.

**Proposition B.1 (Strong stationary points of $\mathrm{P}^{\rm ae}$ and Nash strong stationary points of $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$)** *Consider the multi-leader multi-follower game with shared constraints* $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$*. Suppose* $(x,y)$ *is a strong-stationary point of* $\mathrm{P}^{\rm ae}$ *and satisfies* (29) *with Lagrange multipliers* $(\eta_i, \mu_i, \lambda_i, \beta_i)_{i=1}^N$*. Then* $(x,y)$ *is a Nash strong-stationary point of* $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$ *and for* $i = 1, \ldots, N$, $(x,y)$ *satisfies* (32) *with Lagrange multipliers defined as* $\left(\bar{\eta}_i, \bar{\mu}_i, \bar{\lambda}_i, (\bar{\beta}_i^k)_{k=1}^N\right) = \left(\eta_i, \mu_i, \lambda_i, (\beta_k)_{k=1}^N\right)$ *Furthermore, if* $(x,y)$ *is a second-order strong stationary point of* $\mathrm{P}^{\rm ae}$ *with multipliers* $(\eta_i, \mu_i, \lambda_i, \beta_i)_{i=1}^N$*, then* $(x,y)$ *is a Nash second-order strong stationary point of* $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$ *with firm i's multipliers given by* $\left(\bar{\eta}_i, \bar{\mu}_i, \bar{\lambda}_i, (\bar{\beta}_i^k)_{k=1}^N\right)$.

**Proof :** Suppose $(x,y)$ is a strong stationary point $\mathrm{P}^{\rm ae}$, i.e., suppose there exist multipliers $\eta, \mu, \lambda$ and $\beta$ such that for $(x,y)$, system (29) holds. For each kind of $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$, we show that $(x,y)$ is a Nash strong stationary point of $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$. One may then construct Lagrange multipliers to satisfy (32). By comparison of (29) and (32), we see that (32) admits a solution $(x,y)$ with multipliers $\bar{\eta}_i = \eta_i, \bar{\mu}_i = \mu_i, \bar{\lambda}_i = \lambda_i$ and $\bar{\beta}_i^k = \beta_k$ for all $i, k$.

Now assume that $(x,y)$ is a second-order strong stationary point of $\mathrm{P}^{\rm ae}$. To show that $(x,y)$ is a Nash second-order strong stationary point of $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$, we construct Lagrange multipliers as above. It is easy to see, that by construction, $\nabla_{x_i,y_i}\mathcal{L} = \nabla_{x_i,y_i}\mathcal{L}_i$ and $\nabla^2_{x_i,y_i}\mathcal{L}_i = \nabla^2_{x_i,y_i}\mathcal{L}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$, where $\mathcal{L}_i$ is the

---

[3] The index sets associated with $\mathrm{P}^{\rm ae}_{rnlp}$ are denoted by $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ while the index sets employed for specifying leader $i$'s relaxed NLP are denoted by $\mathcal{I}_i$. Note that the cardinality of $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_i$ and $\mathcal{I}_i$ differs when considering the relaxed NLPs corresponding to $\mathscr{E}^{\rm ae}$ since every leader level problem contains equilibrium constraints of all the leaders.

Lagrangian of $\mathrm{L}_i^{\mathrm{ae}}$ evaluated at $(x, y)$ and the above constructed Lagrange multipliers. Furthermore, by comparing the feasible region of $\mathrm{L}_i^{\mathrm{ae}}$ with $\mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{ae}}$, we observe that the active sets of $\mathrm{L}_i^{\mathrm{ae}}$ can be defined as $\mathcal{A}_i(x, y) = \left\{ \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_i^c(x, y), \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_i^d(x, y), \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_1^e(x, y), \ldots, \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_N^e(x, y) \right\}$.

Given the specification of the active set, we may now define a relaxed NLP corresponding to this active set as well as define the corresponding critical cone $S_i^*(x, y)$. To prove the claim, we proceed by contradiction. If $(x, y)$ is not a Nash second-order strong stationary point, then for some $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, the point $(x_i, y_i)$ does not satisfy second-order strong stationary conditions, given $(x^{-i}, y^{-i})$. Then there exists a $w_i$ such that $w_i \in S_i^*(x, y)$ such that $w_i^\top \nabla^2_{x_i, y_i} \mathcal{L}_i^* w_i \leq 0$. We may now define $\mathbf{w}$ such that

$$\mathbf{w} \triangleq (w_1, \ldots, w_N),$$

where $w_j = 0, j \neq i$. Since $w_i \in S_i^*(x, y)$, it follows that

$$0 = w_i^\top \nabla_{x_i, y_i} \varphi_i(x, y) = w_i^\top \nabla_{x_i, y_i} \pi(x, y).$$

By definition of $\mathbf{w}$, it follows that $\mathbf{w}^\top \nabla_{x,y} \pi(x, y) = 0$. From the definition of $\mathbf{w}$ and by noting the constructions of $\mathcal{A}_i(x, y)$, it can be seen that $\mathbf{w} \in S^*(x, y)$. As a consequence, we have that

$$0 \geq w_i^T \nabla^2_{x_i, y_i} \mathcal{L}_i w_i = \mathbf{w}^T \nabla^2_{x_i, y_i} \mathcal{L} \ \mathbf{w}.$$

But this contradicts the hypothesis that $(x, y)$ is a second-order strong stationary point of $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{ae}}$ and the result follows. ■

As a final note, it is not entirely necessary to employ the algebraic characterization of the constraints in articulating strong stationarity (cf. [14, 18]). For instance, the authors examine the optimality conditions of a disjunctive program defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_x \quad & f(x) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & x \in \Lambda \triangleq \bigcup_{i=1}^m \Lambda_i, \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where $\Lambda_i$ is a convex polyhedron for $i = 1, \ldots, m$. Such a problem captures most MPEC models considered in the research literature. The authors proceed to show that if the generalized Guignard constraint qualification and a suitably defined intersection property holds at a local minimizer $z$, then $z$ is a strong stationary point. Note that the definition of strong stationarity relies on using the Frećhet normal cone associated with $\Lambda_i$ rather than the algebraic characterization of the sets.

## References

[1] B. Allaz and J.-L. Vila. Cournot competition, forward markets and efficiency. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 59.

[2] T. Alpcan and T. Başar. Distributed algorithms for Nash equilibria of flow control games. *Annals of Dynamic Games 7 (2003) to appear.*, 2003.

[3] K. Arrow and G. Debreu. Existence of an equilibrium for a competitive economy. *Econometrica*, 22(3):265–290, July 1954.

[4] T. Başar and G. Olsder. *Dynamic Noncooperative Game Theory.* Classics in Applied Mathematics, SIAM, Philadelphia, 1999.

[5] T. Başar. Control and game-theoretic tools for communication networks. *Appl. Comput. Math.*, 6(2):104–125, 2007.

[6] J. Cardell, C. Hitt, and W. Hogan. Market power and strategic interaction in electricity networks. *Resource and Energy Economics*, 19(1):109–137, 1997.

[7] V. DeMiguel and H. Xu. A stochastic multiple-meader Stackelberg model: Analysis, computation, and application. *Operations Research*, 57(5):1220–1235, September 2009.

[8] J. F. Escobar and A. Jofré. Equilibrium analysis of electricity auctions. *Department of Economics Stanford University*, 2008.

[9] F. Facchinei, A. Fischer, and V. Piccialli. On generalized Nash games and variational inequalities. *Operations Research Letters*, 35(2):159–164, March 2007.

[10] F. Facchinei and C. Kanzow. Generalized Nash equilibrium problems. *4OR: A Quarterly Journal of Operations Research*, 5(3):173–210, 2007.

[11] F. Facchinei and J.-S. Pang. *Finite-Dimensional Variational Inequalities and Complementarity Problems I.* Springer, New York, first edition, February 2003.

[12] F. Facchinei and J.-S. Pang. *Finite-dimensional variational inequalities and complementarity problems. Vol. I.* Springer Series in Operations Research. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003.

[13] F. Facchinei and J.-S. Pang. Nash equilibria: The Variational Approach. In *Convex Optimization in Signal Processing and Communication*, chapter 12, pages 443–495. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2009.

[14] M. L. Flegel, C. Kanzow, and J. Outrata. Optimality conditions for disjunctive programs with application to mathematical programs with equilibrium constraints. 2007.

[15] R. Fletcher, S. Leyffer, D. Ralph, and S. Scholtes. Local convergence of SQP methods for mathematical programs with equilibrium constraints. Technical report, Department of Mathematics, University of Dundee, UK, Numerical Analysis Report NA/209., 2002.

[16] R. Green. The electricity contract market in england and wales. *The Journal of Industrial Economics*, 47(1):pp. 107–124, 1999.

[17] P. T. Harker. Generalized Nash games and quasi-variational inequalities. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 54(1):81–94, September 1991.

[18] R. Henrion, J. Outrata, and T. Surowiec. A note on the relation between strong and m-stationarity for a class of mathematical programs with equilibrium constraints. *Kybernetika*, 46(3):423–434, 2010.

[19] R. Henrion, J. Outrata, and T. Surowiec. Analysis of m-stationary points to an epec modeling oligopolistic competition in an electricity spot market. *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*, 1(1), 2009.

[20] B. F. Hobbs, C. B. Metzler, and J.-S. Pang. Strategic gaming analysis for electric power systems: An MPEC approach. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 15:638–645, 2000.

[21] X. Hu and D. Ralph. Using EPECs to model bilevel games in restructured electricity markets with locational prices. *Oper. Res.*, 55(5):809–827, 2007.

[22] R. Kamat and S. Oren. Two-settlement systems for electricity markets under network uncertainty and market power. *Journal of Regulatory Economics*, 25(1):5–37, 2004.

[23] A. A. Kulkarni and U. V. Shanbhag. New insights on generalized nash games with shared constraints: Constrained and variational equilibria. In *Decision and Control, 2009 held jointly with the 2009 28th Chinese Control Conference. CDC/CCC 2009. Proceedings of the 48th IEEE Conference on*, pages 151–156, dec. 2009.

[24] A. A. Kulkarni and U. V. Shanbhag. On the variational equilibrium as a refinement of the generalized Nash equilibrium. *Automatica*, 48(1):45–55, 2012.

[25] A. A. Kulkarni and U. V. Shanbhag. Revisiting generalized Nash games and variational inequalities. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 154(1):1–12, 2012.

[26] S. Leyffer and T. Munson. Solving multi-leader-common-follower games. *Optimization Methods and Software*, 25(4):601–623, 2010.

[27] Z.-Q. Luo, J.-S. Pang, and D. Ralph. *Mathematical Programs with Equilibrium Constraints*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.

[28] D. Monderer and L. S. Shapley. Potential games. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 14(1):124–143, May 1996.

[29] F. Murphy and Y. Smeers. On the impact of forward markets on investments in oligopolistic markets with reference to electricity. *Oper. Res.*, 58(3):515–528, 2010. Supplementary data available online.

[30] K. Okuguchi. Expectations and stability in oligopoly models. In *Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems 138*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1976.

[31] J. V. Outrata. A note on a class of equilibrium problems with equilibrium constraints. *Kybernetika*, 40(5):585–594, 2004.

[32] J.-S. . Pang and G. Scutari. Nonconvex games with side constraints. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 21(4):1491–1522, 2011.

[33] J.-S. Pang and M. Fukushima. Quasi-variational inequalities, generalized Nash equilibria, and multi-leader-follower games. *Computational Management Science*, 2(1):21–56, 2005.

[34] J.-S. Pang and M. Fukushima. Complementarity constraint qualifications and simplified B-stationarity conditions for mathematical programs with equilibrium constraints. *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 13(1-3):111–136, 1999.

[35] J. B. Rosen. Existence and uniqueness of equilibrium points for concave $N$-person games. *Econometrica*, 33(3):520–534, July 1965.

[36] H. Scheel and S. Scholtes. Mathematical programs with complementarity constraints: Stationarity, optimality and sensitivity. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 25:1–22, 2000.

[37] R. Selten. Reexamination of the perfectness concept for equilibrium points in extensive games. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 4(1):25–55, March 1975.

[38] U. V. Shanbhag, G. Infanger, and P. W. Glynn. A complementarity framework for forward contracting under uncertainty. *Operations Research*, 59(810–834), 2011.

[39] H. D. Sherali. A multiple leader Stackelberg model and analysis. *Operations Research*, 32(2):390–404, March 1984.

[40] H. D. Sherali, A. L. Soyster, and F. H. Murphy. Stackelberg-Nash-Cournot equilibria: Characterizations and computations. *Operations Research*, 31(2):253–276, 1983.

[41] H. V. Stackelberg. *The Theory of Market Economy.* Oxford University Press, London, 1952.

[42] C.-L. Su. *Equilibrium Problems with Equilibrium Constraints.* PhD thesis, Department of Management Science and Engineering (Operations Research), Stanford University, 2005.

[43] C.-L. Su. Analysis on the forward market equilibrium model. *Operations Research Letters*, 35(1):74–82, 2007.

[44] J. Yao, I. Adler, and S. S. Oren. Modeling and computing two-settlement oligopolistic equilibrium in a congested electricity network. *Oper. Res.*, 56(1):34–47, 2008.

[45] H. Yin, U. V. Shanbhag, and P. G. Mehta. Nash equilibrium problems with scaled congestion costs and shared constraints. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, 56(7):1702–1708, 2011.